DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 278 488 PS 016 287

AUTHOR Ozkaptan, Halim; And Others
TITLE A Profile of Army Families in USAREUR: Results of the 1983 Families in Europe Survey. Research Report 1428.
INSTITUTION Army Research Inst. for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, Alexandria, Va.
REPORT NO ARI-RR-1428
PUB DATE Jun 86
NOTE 78p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adjustment (to Environment); Community Involvement; Demography; *Family Attitudes; *Family Characteristics; Family Financial Resources; *Family Life; *Family Problems; *Military Personnel; Profiles; Quality of Life; Spouses; Surveys; Tables (Data); Well Being
IDENTIFIERS *Army; *Europe

ABSTRACT

This report contains the results of a survey conducted in May 1983 of Army families in USARFUR (United States Army--Europe). A total of 1,036 married and accompanied family members, both military member and spouse, were surveyed. The sample was representative of the approximately 60,000 families in USAREUR in terms of rank distribution, combat unit type, and size of military community. The purpose of the survey was to obtain a broad range of information on family life in the Army and to assess family experiences in coming to and adjusting to life overseas. Sections of the report focus on family demographics, family wellness, family partnership with the Army, member's sense of community, the quality of life, adaptation to USAREUR, and family problems and concerns. Discussion centers on data presented in 38 tables and is organized to serve as a reference source for Army planners and decision makers engaged in the formulation and assessment of programs and policies that impact on Army families. Information concerning research method, sampling plan, and sample characteristics is appended. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED278488

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Research Report 1428

A Profile of Army Families in USAREUR: Results of the 1983 Families in Europe Survey

Halim Ozkaptan, William Sanders, and Robert Holz

ARI Scientific Coordination Office in USAREUR
Office of the Technical Director

PS 016287

U. S. Army

Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences

June 1986

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U. S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

A Field Operating Agency under the Jurisdiction of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

WM. DARRYL HENDERSON
COL, IN
Commanding

Technical review by

Arthur J. Drucker
M. A. Fischl
Hyder-Ali G. Lakhani
Shelley A. Thomas

NOTICES

DISTRIBUTION: Primary distribution of this report has been made by ARI. Please address correspondence concerning distribution of reports to: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, ATTN: PERI-POT, 5001 Eisenhower Ave., Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600.

FINAL DISPOSITION: This report may be destroyed when it is no longer needed. Please do not return it to the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences.

NOTE: The findings in this report are not to be construed as an official Department of the Army position, unless so designated by other authorized documents.

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER ARI Research Report 1428	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) A PROFILE OF ARMY FAMILIES IN USAREUR: RESULTS OF THE 1983 FAMILIES IN EUROPE SURVEY		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Period ending June 1984 6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER --
7. AUTHOR(s) Halim Ozkaptan, William Sanders, and Robert Holz		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) --
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS 63731A 2Q263731A792 2.4.2
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences 5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, VA 22333-5600		12. REPORT DATE June 1986 13. NUMBER OF PAGES 75
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office) --		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified 15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE --

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

--

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

--

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Army families
Family wellness
Sense of community
Partnership
Quality of life

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Family wellness, partnership with the Army, and sense of community were identified as important Army family issues in the White Paper, "The Army Family," issued by the Chief of Staff in August 1983. This report presents the views and perceptions of over 1,000 Army families in USAREUR, both military members and spouses, with respect to family life in the Army and more specifically, family experiences associated with an overseas assignment. The data have been

(continued)

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

ARI Research Report 1428

20. (Continued)

organized to serve as a reference source for Army planners and decision makers in their formulation and assessment of programs and policies that impact on Army families.

Research Report 1428

A Profile of Army Families in USAREUR: Results of the 1983 Families in Europe Survey

Halim Ozkaptan, William Sanders, and Robert Holz

ARI Scientific Coordination Office in USAREUR
LTC Ford McClain, Chief

Office of the Technical Director

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333-5600

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

June 1986

Army Project Number
2Q263731A792

Manpower and Personnel

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

ARI Research Reports and Technical Reports are intended for sponsors of R&D tasks and for other research and military agencies. Any findings ready for implementation at the time of publication are presented in the last part of the Brief. Upon completion of a major phase of the task, formal recommendations for official action normally are conveyed to appropriate military agencies by briefing or Disposition Form.

1984 was designated as the Year of the Army Family by the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable John O. Marsh, and the Chief of Staff, General John A. Wickham, Jr. This report presents the views and perceptions of over 1,000 Army families in USAREUR, with respect to family life in the Army and more specifically, family experiences associated with an overseas assignment. It addresses the issues of family wellness, partnership with the Army, and sense of community that were identified as important Army issues in the White Paper, "The Army Family," issued by the Chief of Staff in August 1983. The data have been organized to serve as a reference source for Army planners and decision makers in their formulation and assessment of programs and policies that impact on Army families.

EDGAR M. JOHNSON
Technical Director

A PROFILE OF ARMY FAMILIES IN USAREUR: RESULTS OF THE 1983 FAMILIES IN EUROPE SURVEY

PREFACE

This report contains the results of a survey conducted in May 1983 of Army families in USAREUR, in which 1,036 married and accompanied family members, both military member (MM) and spouse (SP), were surveyed. The sample of families surveyed was representative of the approximately 60,000 families in USAREUR in terms of rank distribution, combat unit type, and size of military community. The specific characteristics of the sample relative to the USAREUR population are described in Appendix A.

The purpose of the survey was to obtain a broad range of information on family life in the Army and to assess family experiences coming to and adjusting to life in USAREUR. The White Paper, "The Army Family," was issued by the Chief of Staff in August 1983. While this important policy paper was issued after the development and administration of the survey, the results of the survey have been organized relative to the major issues identified in it.

The survey instrument was a collaborative effort between personnel from the University of Minnesota and the ARI USAREUR Field Unit. It contains specific scales prepared by the University of Minnesota, and questions added by Field Unit members. Approximately 400 questions were asked. In the following compilation of data, the scale and the other categories of questions asked have been sorted into categories reflective of the White Paper and other USAREUR specific issues.

The responses of the MM and SP are presented together where the same question was asked of each. However, only averages of each group are compared to one another. The responses of paired family members are not analyzed per se. In some cases questions were asked of only one or the other family member. The data are also organized relative to the enlisted, NCO, and officer groups. As can be seen by the following tables, the data are highlighted when significant response differences occur between the MMs of each rank group or the SPs of each rank group. The data are also highlighted when significant response differences occur between the MM and SP in the same rank group. Often the between-rank and family member differences within each rank group are more meaningful than the absolute level of the responses themselves. The following interpretation of the data is based on both of these considerations. Only descriptive data in percentages are presented. Inferential analyses were not conducted on the data of different response categories.

The information presented in the following tables is intended to serve as a reference source for Army planners and decision makers in their formulation and assessment of programs and policies that impact on Army families. Highlights of the data are discussed in the following sections. The reported results are not meant to be conclusive. The reader will gain additional insights by his or her own inspection of the tabulated data.

A PROFILE OF ARMY FAMILIES IN USAREUR: RESULTS OF THE 1983 FAMILIES IN EUROPE SURVEY

CONTENTS

	Page
OVERVIEW OF RESULTS	1
FAMILY SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS	4
Family Characteristics	4
Family Resources/Employment	7
Military Member Experience	9
USAREUR Housing: Type, Acquisition, and Location	10
FAMILY WELLNESS	12
Family Bonds	12
Family Patterns of Interaction	16
Role of the Spouse: Traditionalism vs. Egalitarianism	20
Ability of the Spouse to Cope While the Military Member Is Away	23
Family Activities	23
FAMILY PARTNERSHIP WITH ARMY	26
SENSE OF COMMUNITY	28
QUALITY OF LIFE	31
Experiences Relative to Expectations About USAREUR	32
Community Life in USAREUR Relative to Previous Assignment	34
Community Support Services in USAREUR Relative to Those of the Previous Assignment	37
Satisfaction	42
ADAPTATION TO USAREUR	44
Predeployment Experiences	44
Experiences Upon Arrival in USAREUR	46
Aids to Adjustment in USAREUR	48
Cultural Skills Possessed by Family Members in USAREUR	49
FAMILY PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS	51
Army Mission-Related Family Problems	51
Personal Problems Experienced by Army Family Members in USAREUR	52
Problems Influencing Plans for Extension	55
Sponsor Support	56
CONCLUSIONS	58

Page

APPENDIX A. METHOD, SAMPLING PLAN, AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS 59

B. REFERENCES 65

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Army family sample demographics 5

2. Religious preference and nationality of wife 7

3. Family resources 8

4. Employment and volunteer activities 9

5. Military member experience in USAREUR 10

6. USAREUR housing: Type, acquisition, and location 11

7. Family bonds: Items where agreement indicates family unity or well-being 13

8. Family bonds: Items where disagreement indicates family unity or well-being 14

9. Positive patterns of family interaction where frequency of occurrence indicates success 17

10. Negative patterns of family interaction where lack of occurrence indicates success 19

11. Sex roles in the family where agreement indicates traditionalism 21

12. Sex roles in the family where disagreement indicates egalitarianism 22

13. Ability of the wife to cope with short-term family separations--resiliency 24

14. Family activities 25

15. Family partnership with the Army 27

16. Sense of community 30

17. Family life experiences in USAREUR that were better than expected 32

Page

Table 18. Family life experiences in USAREUR that were worse than expected 33

19. Community life experiences in USAREUR rated much better than the previous assignment 35

20. Community life experiences in USAREUR rated much worse than the previous assignment 36

21. Quality of community life in USAREUR compared to previous assignment 38

22. Community support services rated much better than the previous assignment 39

23. Community support services rated much worse than the previous assignment 40

24. Quality of community support in USAREUR compared to the previous assignment 41

25. Key elements of family satisfaction in USAREUR 43

26. Problems with permanent change of station to USAREUR 45

27. Problems experienced following arrival in USAREUR 47

28. Aids to adjustment in USAREUR 48

29. Cultural skills possessed by family members in USAREUR 50

30. Army mission-related family problems 52

31. Personal problems experienced by Army family members in USAREUR 53

32. Family members' faith in noncombatant evacuation operations (NEO) 54

33. Problems influencing plans for tour extension 55

34. Command-sponsored families with a sponsor assigned by rank . . 56

35. The nature and extent of sponsor support 57

36. The number of survey sets administered and returned for each community 61

Page

Table 37. Comparison of the percentage married and accompanied relative to the total married in each rank category between the sample and USAREUR population 62

38. Percentage of each rank category in USAREUR in comparison to the percentage of the married and accompanied in that rank category 64

A PROFILE OF ARMY FAMILIES IN USAREUR: RESULTS OF THE 1983 FAMILIES IN EUROPE SURVEY

OVERVIEW OF RESULTS

Contrary to expectations and rumor, Army families in USAREUR report being satisfied with their family life, feel a commitment to the Army, and report the resiliency necessary to cope with the unique demands of Army life. They also feel that an Army career can be good for the family. Nevertheless, they are not fully satisfied with Army support, are somewhat cynical about Army attitudes toward the family, and are not completely happy with Army life. Their satisfaction with family life in the Army, however, seems to compensate for these reported shortfalls. In effect, it appears that family satisfaction sustains a career in the Army. Hence, it can be said that when the Army supports its families it is also supporting itself.

Service members who are married and accompanied represent 27.8% of the total USAREUR force. As would be expected, a greater percentage of officers are married than are enlisted personnel: 52% of the officers are married, while 44% and 10% of the NCOs and enlisted personnel are married, respectively. The Army families in each rank group are not distributed uniformly throughout USAREUR: 36% of the officer families are located in the larger and urban communities that have only 6% of the enlisted married families. Sixty-four percent of the enlisted families, on the other hand, are located in the smaller and rural communities. The relative isolation of the enlisted families is further compounded by the fact that 45% of them are non-command sponsored, while only 12% and 3% of the NCOs and officers are non-command sponsored. The majority of the enlisted personnel live on the economy (58%), while the majority of the NCOs (65%) and officers (85%) have permanent military housing.

In terms of racial group identification, 59% of the enlisted members report being white, with the balance being black (26%) and Hispanic (12%). The NCO ranks have a similar race distribution. Ninety percent of the officers, however, report being white, with 5% black and 3% Hispanic. Fifty-three percent of the enlisted members report having completed high school, 40% of the NCOs report having some college education, and 43% of the officers report having some graduate school training.

Regardless of the above diversity in the backgrounds of military families, they report, as a group, a similar and positive view of life in USAREUR. As would be expected, however, the enlisted families report the most problems while the officer families report the fewest problems. The differences between the rank groups are not extreme. Where the differences occur, they range between 10 and 20 percentage points, with the officer families reporting the higher percentage of positive responses. As one would expect, the nature and type of problems also differ as age, rank, experience, and financial resources differ. In this respect, enlisted families report more financial and job-related problems. However, the level of satisfaction is generally equivalent among rank groups in such areas as family life and housing.

The good news in these data is that Army families report unusually high family bonds and cohesion. The majority of MMs and their spouses either agree

or strongly agree to a series of questions that tap this area. For convenience the responses of the spouse are listed immediately after those of the MM. Ninety-six percent of both soldiers and spouses report "a deep commitment to each other." Similarly, (92/91%) of the families report that they feel that members "show their love and affection." The families also report that "no one could be happier than when we are together" (86/83%), do not feel taken for granted (82/73%), and have the ability to see the brighter side when faced with family problems (87/89%). On top of this very positive picture, (53/51%) feel that as a family they are "a perfect success." It seems clear that Army families, as families, thrive in the Army environment, despite some frustrations and problems as reported later in this section.

The Army families can also be considered to have a mixture of traditional and egalitarian values. The MM and spouses, however, do not always share the same views. The spouse tends to be more liberal or egalitarian. The families view the MM as the leader (77/67%), and feel that the spouse should accept the MM's judgment on important matters (71/65%). However, they do not feel that the MM should have the final word in most of the important decisions (45/40%), nor that a spouse's place is in the home (26/27%). Of some interest is the fact that the MM is more willing to place the importance of the spouse's occupation at a level equal to his, while the spouse sees his occupation as being somewhat more important (52/56%).

Field assignments, alerts, and TDYs place a high premium on the ability of the spouse to cope while the MM is away. The lack of the requisite coping skills in a spouse can be a source of stress for the MM. The data indicate that the spouses are quite adept at coping when the MM is on duty, and perceive their skills in a more positive light than do the MMs: (86/94%) report they can handle family finances, and (76/84%) report they can handle an emergency. The spouses also feel they can maintain a positive attitude during family separations (66/78%). As would be expected, the spouses of officers report a higher ability to cope.

The Army family, despite living in a European environment, seems to spend free time in a manner equivalent to state-side families. Seventy-one percent report spending most weekends and evenings at home, with 63% reporting that they watch TV or listen to the radio as their main form of entertainment. Fifty percent or more of the officer families, however, report going out a lot or attending courses. In addition, more officer families report being involved in sport and recreational activities.

The Army has been viewed as an institution, a way of life, where a partnership must be forged between the Army and Army family needs. Several questions tapped this dimension. The data indicate that the MMs and their spouses accept this partnership <u>despite</u> some serious misgivings: (71/73%) report a commitment to the lifestyle and mission of the Army; (83/86%) feel that an Army career can be good for the family. As would be expected, higher percentages of officers express these views. The Army is viewed not only positively as an institution but also as being good for the family. This is consistent with the cohesiveness and family strengths reported earlier. Yet only (40/41%) feel that they are treated justly, and only (36/43%) feel that the "Army does take care of its family and wants them to be all they can be." Thus while Army families thrive in the Army environment, they are somewhat dubious of Army

policies. Only (57/67%) feel they can get help for special needs and problems of the family.

In addition to feelings of partnership with the Army, sense of community is another and equally important variable when one considers the family in the context of the Army system. The spouse and family are embedded in the relatively isolated culture of the Army, which also becomes synonymous with American culture when stationed outside of the continental United States (CONUS). The military community then becomes and forms an important part of the families' environment. In this respect, the results of the survey are not as positive as those found for family bonds and commitment to the Army. Approximately 30% of the respondents respond in a positive way (agree or strongly agree) to the items touching on this variable and 20% to 30% reported not sure; (35/36%) reported that the community gave them a secure feeling, with (19/22%) being unsure; (27/32%) reported that people can depend upon each other in this community, with (38/39%) being unsure; (43/46%) reported that even strangers in their community would help them in an emergency, with (26/34%) being unsure. It appears that the Army families, which are frequently uprooted, do not readily or automatically feel at home in an Army community, but like their civilian counterparts take their neighbors as they find them.

The primary strengths of the family, it would seem, are derived from the family itself and in turn their commitment to the Army. Their commitment to the Army may be a function of the fact that, for whatever reason, their basic family lifestyles and/or needs are met in the Army environment, despite specific frustrations in one or more areas.

Coming to Europe and adjusting to a foreign culture and environment require considerable personal adaptation skills, even with the considerable institutional support provided by the Army. Ten items were designed to assess the factors that aided adjustment to USAREUR: The questions were asked of the spouse only. Ninety-three percent across all rank groups reported that the support of spouse and family was helpful or very helpful. "Personal attitude" (thinking positively) was also an important variable, with 86% reporting this factor. However, officers' spouses reported this variable significantly more often than the enlisted and NCO families. As would be expected, previous experience was also reported as helpful (91%), although this variable was correlated with rank. Sponsors, when they had one, were reported to be helpful (47%). What stands out across all rank groups, however, is "support of spouse and family," which again points out the strength provided by the family during an important period of change and adjustment, as well as stress.

It appears that while some Army families are undergoing some family stress in USAREUR, the majority are faring well or slightly better than they did in their previous assignment: (15/13%) report the quality of their marital relationship as being "much worse than" it was before coming to USAREUR, while (21/21%) report it as being "much better than" before. However, (80/82%) report their marital relationship as being "just as good" or "much better" than it was before they came to Europe. Spouse happiness fares less well: (37/33%) report "much worse than" before, while (14/16%) report "much better than before." Only (57/60%) report "just as good" or "much better" than before. Children's happiness appears less: (26/26%) of the parents report "much worse than" before and (8/10%) report "much better than before." On balance (69/70%) report "just as good" or "much better" in USAREUR with respect to children's

happiness. The above mixed picture is in part related to rank. The higher ranks have the discretionary means to enjoy travel and eating out, and have more cultural opportunities in the larger and urban communities where they are located. The responses regarding children's happiness, however, are about the same for all rank categories.

The majority of the families surveyed report being "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with their family life in USAREUR (57/65%). Satisfaction in this respect increases as rank increases. Of interest is the higher satisfaction reported by the spouse. This pattern also occurs for housing satisfaction (52/61%), and is about the same for all rank groups. Spouse satisfaction with Army life, however, is relatively lower (46/51%). The latter results, however, are strongly related to rank. Enlisted famiies are much less satisfied (32/35%) than officers (74/74%). These results and those reported earlier imply the pre-eminence of the family in the value structure and satisfaction of the service member and his spouse. One could form the hypothesis that family satisfaction can compensate for dissatisfaction with the Army. In addition, a relatively happier spouse helps to support an Army career. From another point of view, one could also say that positive family life is compatible with and sustained by the Army.

The above information on families has important implications for the Army. Its success in this area supports reenlistments and reinforces the value of the new initiative with respect to family support. In effect, and for whatever reason, families on balance seem to prosper in the Army. This may account for their high commitment to the Army and their feeling that an Army career can be good for the family, as well as their willingness to forbear the specific problems that are reported. Their reported commitment to the Army, however, may be a function of the degree to which the family unit is sustained. Hence, the Army supports its own best interests when it supports the Army family.

The picture of Army families, however, is not all bright. Problems with drugs/alcohol (10%), with police (2%), steps toward separation or divorce (3.9%), thoughts of suicide (2.5%), and extreme anger or abuse (8.7%) are reported. The extent that these statistics parallel those of our society as a whole are not available. Thus, one cannot attribute these findings to be a result solely of life in the Army.

FAMILY SAMPLE DEMOGRAPHICS

Family Characteristics

Ideally, estimation of the characteristics of the USAREUR married force would be done through an extensive archival search of existing personnel records, but a great deal of important family information is not recorded. However, a more comprehensive but less accurate approach for describing the makeup of USAREUR Army families is provided by the 1,000-family survey population. As would be expected, the characteristics of Army families differ as a function of rank. The information in Table 1 provides an overview of the families surveyed. The data for each rank group can be summarized as follows:

Table 1

Army Family Sample Demographics

Demographic profile of sample families	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Sex						
Male	100	0	100	0	100	0
Age						
17-25	.72	.78	.22	.32	.06	.11
26-30	.23	.16	.32	.31	.20	.23
31 and over	.05	.06	.46	.36	.74	.66
Race						
Black	.25	.23	.23	.18	.05	.03
Hispanic	.12	.14	.09	.07	.01	.01
White	.58	.56	.64	.64	.92	.93
Other	.05	.07	.05	.11	.03	.02
Education						
No high school degree	.06	.21	.02	.19		
GED	.15	.03	.13	.07		.01
High school degree	.53	.39	.38	.37		.12
Some college	.23	.25	.40	.24	.03	.31
College/graduate degree	.02	.12	.06	.13	.98	.55
Other	.02	.05	.02	.06		.04
Spouse enrolled in education program now						
Yes		.04		.06		.10
Spouse ever served in armed forces						
Yes		.08		.06		.04
Number of times married						
First	.89		.77		.90	
Length of marriage						
0-3 years	.72		.26		.17	
4-6 years	.22		.25		.15	
7-10 years	.04		.23		.14	
11 years	.02		.26		.54	
Average years	3.83		7.46		10.38	
Number of children						
None	.26		.14		.19	
One	.43		.24		.18	
Two or more	.31		.62		.63	

Table 1 (continued)

Demographic profile of sample families	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Percentage of families with children ages:						
Less than 3 years	.82		.54		.36	
4-5 years	.24		.30		.20	
6-11 years	.24		.52		.57	
12-18 years	.04		.27		.44	
19+ years			.08		.12	
Spouse working						
Yes	.27		.40		.40	
First USAREUR tour						
Yes	.85		.38		.65	
Have any children left at home:						
Yes	.01		.08		.11	

Enlisted families (E1-E4): Young (3/4 between 17 and 25 years old); most have been married less than 4 years; have one-child family; most are high school graduates or better; 85% are serving their first USAREUR tour; and about 25% of the wives work. Over one third are racial/ethnic minorities.

Noncommissioned officer families (E5-E9): Most are in their 30s and early 40s and have two or more children. Over three quarters have a high school degree or better. Only 38% are serving their first USAREUR tour. Over one third of the wives work. About one quarter of the families are a second marriage, and about one quarter are racial/ethnic minorities.

Officer families (O1-O6): Most are in their late 30s; are in a first marriage with two or more children; almost all are white and college educated; 65% are serving their first USAREUR tour. Over one third of the wives work.

Religious preference and church attendance as well as country of birth of the spouse are presented in Table 2. As can be seen, most officers are Protestant and attend church more regularly than the enlisted and NCO families. Some 16% of the enlisted personnel and 31% of the NCOs are married to foreign-born women. In particular, 18% of the NCOs, and 6% of the enlisted and officer military members are married to German women.

Table 2

Religious Preference and Nationality of Wife

	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Religious preference:						
Protestant	.36	.33	.49	.46	.60	.61
Catholic	.25	.28	.23	.25	.22	.27
Jewish			.01	.01	.01	.01
Moslem	.02	.01	.01			
Latter Day Saint	.02	.03	.02	.02	.03	.03
Other	.22	.27	.06	.21	.07	.07
None	.12	.08	.09	.06	.06	.03
How often do you attend church/ synagogue services?						
Several times a week or every week	.07	.12	.12	.15	.36	.37
Several times a month	.08	.11	.07	.08	.12	.15
Several times a year	.21	.20	.18	.24	.19	.23
Infrequently/never	.64	.57	.64	.54	.33	.25
(Spouse) Country of birth:						
United States		.84		.69		.91
Korea		.02		.05		
Germany		.07		.18		.06
Other European		.01		.02		.01
Other		.05		.06		.02

Family Resources/Employment

The data in Table 3 provide information on several basic types of family resources. Total family income is one of the most basic assets an Army family has for coping with the demands of USAREUR life. Income will vary as a function of both the rank of the military member and spouse employment. Personal transportation is another resource that should aid in coping with life in USAREUR. As would be expected, as rank increases the likelihood that the family possesses a car and driver's license increases. It is important to note that for enlisted and NCO families, the spouse is much less likely to have a driver's license. This fact could be a source of problems, particularly with employment, as the enlisted and NCO families are also primarily located in the smaller military communities (as shown in Table 6), where public transportation may be less available. Power of attorney is considered a family resource as it can allow the spouse to do family business such as signing for housing and household goods, and the initiation of Deferred Payment Plan (DPP) purchases. As can be seen from the data in Table 3, about half of all spouses have a power of attorney presently, and this is roughly equal across rank groups.

Table 3

Family Resources

	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Total annual family income						
$10,000 or less	.45		.08			
$10,000-$20,000	.53		.67		.12	
$20,000-$30,000	.01		.20		.36	
$30,000-$40,000	.01		.05		.52	
Average	$10,769		$17,189		$29,000	
Do you have a USAREUR driver's license?						
Yes	.75	.32	.89	.50	.98	.93
Do you have a car?	.69		.86		.99	
(Spouse) Power of attorney:						
Yes		.53		.47		.48

Many spouses, and a small percentage of military members, work or "moonlight" either full or part time during their USAREUR tour. Table 4 shows that "moonlighting" occurs at a low rate among enlisted personnel and NCOs. The same number of NCO and officer spouses are working in USAREUR as were working in their previous assignment. However, only half as many enlisted spouses who were previously working are now working in USAREUR. This appears to be an important difference. Looking at the "Reasons for not working now" question, it appears that reduced enlisted spouse employment may be due to the lack of jobs in the more rural areas where these spouses are located, and may also be influenced by problems with transportation or lack of job skills. Employment, whether half time or full time, does not differ among the ranks. About two thirds of the working spouses have full-time jobs, and about one third have half-time jobs. Enlisted and NCO wives most often cite "Paying bills" as the reason for working, while officer wives report "Personal satisfaction" as the primary reason for working.

The Army Family Action Plan (Army Family Action Plan, 1984) states that "the Army philosophy on the use of volunteers has not kept pace with the changing Army." While the need for a better trained and educated volunteer is increasing, the demographic trends indicate that more wives are instead seeking employment. The Action Plan suggests that a move might be made to have volunteers "officially recognized" as connected to Army units as a motivation to increase volunteerism. The data in Table 4 present the voluntary activities that spouses most frequently participate in, such as PTA. Enlisted and NCO spouse participation is low across all activities, while officer spouses are much more involved in unit or wives club functions.

Table 4

Employment and Volunteer Activities

		Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Military member moonlighting:	Yes	.11	.11	.03
Spouse employment:				
Prior to USAREUR?	Yes	.48	.48	.44
Working now?	Yes	.27	.44	.44
Full time?	Yes	.67	.76	.66
Half time?	Yes	.33	.24	.34
Why working now?				
Pay bills		.45	.40	.20
Personal satisfaction		.22	.23	.44
Self-esteem		.04	.13	.17
Keep busy/out		.20	.12	.08
Help career		.08	.14	.11
Why not working now? (percentage of those not working)				
No job available		.24	.17	.02
Young children		.34	.44	.57
Other		.42	.39	.40
Volunteer activities (the four most popular) (percentage participating in each)				
ACS		.06	.08	.18
PTA		.05	.08	.34
Wives Club		.05	.08	.55
Unit activities		.03	.04	.28

Military Member Experience

In targeting family support needs a basic question is, "How experienced is the USAREUR married force?" That is, how long have they been with the Army and what previous permanent change of station (PCS) experience do they have? The data in Table 5 indicate that about two thirds of the officers volunteered to come to USAREUR, while roughly one third of the enlisted and NCO personnel volunteered to do so. While most enlisted and officers are on their first USAREUR tour, most NCOs are on their second tour. With regard to how "settled in" the married force is, most of the families sampled have been in USAREUR 1 to 2 years during the present tour.

A relatively short notice of an overseas assignment may cause additional hardships on families. The data in Table 5 indicate that about one third of

the enlisted members received their PCS orders less than 3 month in advance of coming to USAREUR, while the majority of all rank groups got them 1 to 3 months in advance.

Table 5

Military Member Experience in USAREUR

	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Volunteer to come to USAREUR: Yes	.36	.34	.62
Time in service:			
Less than 1 year	.02		
1-3 years	.47	.02	.06
3-6 years	.40	.15	.14
6-10 years	.11	.38	.17
More than 10 years	.01	.46	.63
How long in USAREUR this tour?			
0-6 months	.28	.17	.06
6 months-1 year	.29	.23	.25
1-2 years	.32	.27	.20
2-3 years	.06	.22	.39
3-4 years	.03	.06	.06
4+ years	.02	.06	.04
How many PCSs to USAREUR?			
This tour only	.85	.38	.65
Two	.13	.43	.24
Three or more	.02	.19	.10
How far in advance got PCS orders?			
Less than 1 month	.34	.16	.12
1-3 months	.41	.43	.39
4-6 months	.18	.33	.37
More than 6 months	.08	.08	.12

USAREUR Housing: Type, Acquisition, and Location

Family housing is considered to be one of the most critical issues of family support in USAREUR. In particular, sponsorship, housing wait, and location of duty assignment all have an impact on the Army family's life in USAREUR.

As can be seen in Table 6, about half of the enlisted and almost all of the officer families are command sponsored. As a result, the majority of the enlisted families must make their own housing arrangements and live on the German economy. In line with this, the enlisted family members must also wait

longer before joining the military member in USAREUR. More information on command sponsorship is presented in the section on Sponsor Support.

It is important to be aware that the rank groups are not evenly distributed throughout USARUER. From Table 6, we see that most of the enlisted families are located in the rural German areas. As a result, Army education and shopping support are not as extensive, and similarly there are fewer transportation, shopping, and cultural services available on the local economy. The officer families are primarily located in the medium-size and larger military communities. These communities are located in the more urban and culturally attractive German areas and have more resources available to facilitate family adaptation and render family assistance.

Table 6

USAREUR Housing: Type, Acquisiton, and Location

	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Command sponsored? Yes	.55	.88	.97
Present housing:			
Temporary	.10	.08	.01
Permanent--military on-base	.11	.40	.77
Permanent--military off-base	.21	.25	.10
Privately owned/privately operated	.58	.27	.12
How long waited in the United States?			
Came same time	.10	.33	.39
Less than 1 month	.03	.02	.03
1-3 months	.31	.30	.39
3-6 months	.37	.23	.15
6-9 months	.17	.09	.03
More than 9 months	.03	.04	.01
Average months	3.83	2.68	1.77
Length USAREUR wait for permanent housing:			
No wait	.32	.19	.36
Less than 1 month	.06	.11	.23
1-3 months	.14	.16	.26
3-6 months	.18	.21	.08
More than 6 months	.31	.33	.07
Community size:			
Small	.65	.46	.22
Medium	.29	.44	.42
Large	.06	.10	.36

FAMILY WELLNESS

Family wellness can be thought of as a state of mind brought about through strengths, skills, aptitudes, and attitudes. Because of location in a foreign environment, stressful events can frequently occur for the Army family in USAREUR. Previously, Army plans, programs, and policies have focused on basic family needs or were focused on correcting dysfunctions. The present direction is to identify what is working well, and the characteristics of healthy families that can be transmitted to those needing assistance.

Family researchers see the healthy family as characterized by flexible role relationships and shared power, which promote personal growth and member autonomy. In particular, the family internal capabilities that have gained the most attention as determinants of family and individual wellness are adaptability and cohesiveness. Researchers believe that families functioning moderately along these two dimensions are likely to make more successful adjustments to stress (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

For the study reported here, family wellness was viewed as a function of cohesiveness or family bonding. In terms of adaptability, family patterns of interaction, the role of the spouse (whether traditional or egalitarian), and the ability of the spouse to cope while the soldier is away were also examined.

Family Bonds

Family bonding or cohesiveness can be thought of as a family bond of unity and closeness maintained through both positive and negative experiences. Army families with strong bonds should be better able to face the challenges of Army life in USAREUR and to grow and benefit from the hardships and advantages they experience. The strength of this family bond is usually reflected in the extent to which family members show caring for each other, respect each other's individuality, and empathize with the needs and feelings of each other.

A series of questions, which can be construed as representing family bonds or cohesion, was asked of both the military member and the spouse. Some of the questions were phrased in a positive manner requiring agreement to indicate strong family bonds, while others were phrased negatively requiring disagreement to indicate strong family bonds. The responses to these two different types of questions are presented in Tables 7 and 8, respectively. A different pattern of responses occurs between the rank groups relative to the content of the questions and the manner in which they were phrased. In some cases no rank differences occur, from MM to MM or from SP to SP. In other cases, significant response differences occur between the MM and SP within a specific rank group. The uniformity of responses across ranks and between MMs and their spouses appear to occur for these items tapping important or deep family values. Rank differences appear to occur for those items where age, experience, or financial resources may play a role. Significant response differences between spouses within a rank group seem to indicate value or perceptual differences relative to their respective family roles and perhaps lack of family harmony. The "internal" family differences also seem to fall within specific rank groups, depending upon the type of questions.

Table 7

Family Bonds: Items Where Agreement Indicates Family Unity or Well-Being

Percentage agreeing with the following statements:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
There are times when family members do things that make other members unhappy.	79	86	78 *	85	92'	95'
We feel our family is a perfect success.	57	62'	54	52'	46	39'
No one could be happier than our family when we are together.	89	86	88 *	84	79'	77
I feel good about myself when I sacrifice and give time and energy to members of my family.	96	98'	96 *	94	97 *	90'
When we face problems in our family we have the ability to look on the brighter side of things.	85	87	86	89	94'	97'
Within our family, we have fair and just rules that keep things running smoothly.	87	86	87	85	93	93'
The members of my family make an effort to show their love and affection for me.	90	93	93 *	91	96	93
We always feel a great level of love and affection for each other.	81	80	81 *	77	76	74
The things I do for members of my family and they do for me make me feel part of this very important group.	94	97	94	94	97	97
Our family members have a deep commitment to each other and feel that family life is very important.	95	98	96	96	97	97

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

Table 8

Family Bonds: Items Where Disagreement Indicates Family Unity or Well-Being

Percentage disagreeing with the following statements:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Members of my family seldom listen to my problems and concerns; I usually feel criticized.	77"	78	81 *	73'	94" *	84
Member(s) of my family do not seem to understand me; I feel taken for granted.	74'	75	82' *	71	94' *	80
Family members always understand each other completely.	48'	57'	58' *	67'	75'	81'
If our family has faults, we are unaware of them.	69	75	74	76	89'	88'
When our family faces problems, we do not like to take any help from friends, relatives, and the community.	55	59	51	56	54 *	72'
We expect members of our family to solve their own problems and not to turn to each other for help.	92	91	93	92	93 *	99'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

As noted earlier, some questions as shown in Table 7 tap deep family values and bonds and are responded to uniformly by both family members regardless of rank. In this respect 90% to 95% of the respondents report "---a deep commitment to each other---." Similarly, devotion is expressed by 90% to 95% of the respondents through such questions as, "---I feel good about myself when I sacrifice and give time---," and "---the things I do for my family---make me feel part of this very important group." Such feelings of devotion are perceived as being reciprocated by the respondents. Over 90% indicated that "---my family makes an effort to show their love and devotion for me." The high level and uniformity of the responses to these questions indicate a high level of family unity across all ranks and between family pairs. The consistency of

the responses supports the notion that the central family values of love and devotion transcend occupational and age differences. Regardless of economic and social circumstances, the key goals and values of a marriage are the same. Moreover, these values seem to flourish in the Army.

The high level of positive responses to other questions in this section are also indicative of strong family bonds. Approximately 80% to 90% report that, "no one could be happier than---when we are together," and "---when we face problems, we have the ability to look on the brighter side." A sense of realism, however, is not lost. Over 75% report that, "---our family members do things that make other members unhappy." Only 50% report that "---our family is a perfect success." Statistically significant response differences occur across rank groups for these latter questions. A higher percentage of the enlisted spouses report their marriage as a perfect success than the spouses of the NCOs, who in turn have a higher percentage of positive responses than the officer spouses (62%, 52%, and 39%, respectively). Perhaps the younger enlisted wives are more idealistic in this respect. No statistically significant response differences occur, however, between the MM in each of the rank groups for this particular question.

The NCO MMs and their spouses have a greater tendency to respond differently from each other to this set of questions. Statistically significant response differences occurred between these family members for one half of the questions in Table 7. The difference in their respective perceptions may indicate that this group is at greater risk in terms of marital stability.

Questions that were phrased negatively are shown in Table 8. A high level of disagreement with such questions would imply family unity or well-being. Accordingly, the percentage disagreeing is shown in this table. Only one question has a high level of uniformity between the MMs and SPs in each rank. Over 90% of the respondents disagree with the statement that "---they expect family members to solve their own problems and not turn to each other for help." Once again, feelings for family unity are being expressed. However, 50% to 60% disagree with the statement that they would not turn to friends, relatives, and the community for help on family problems.

Significant rank differences occur for this set of questions. As rank increases, a significantly higher percentage of MMs and their SPs disagree with the statement that "---family members always understand each other completely." Once again, increasing age or experience may be contributing to a more realistic assessment. In this respect, more officer families disagree with the statement that they are unaware of family faults. Of some interest is the fact that as rank decreases more MMs feel "taken for granted." Similarly, NCO and officer spouses report being more "taken for granted" than their spouses. Once again, NCO family members have statistically significant response differences to one half of these questions. The responses of the spouses are more negative.

Findings. Army families, regardless of rank, express feelings of deep commitment and devotion to each other.

The Army families differ across ranks in describing their marriages. As rank increases respondents are less inclined to describe their marriages in idealized terms.

NCOs and their wives, while expressing a basically positive attitude, do differ significantly in their perception of mutual understanding of each other's problems and concerns.

Family Patterns of Interaction

Family patterns of interaction that support successful adjustments to stress can be viewed in terms of mutually supporting family roles and quality of communication. The former occurs when members of the family take on and fulfill roles and tasks in the family in a way that supports each other and keeps them functioning together as a unit. Quality of communication that supports stress adjustment has been viewed as "the ability of family members to listen and express their thoughts and feelings openly and directly to each other." Families who have the ability to communicate are better able to develop shared goals, resolve conflicts, and organize themselves in a way that promotes individual member growth, family functioning, and adaptation to Army life" (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

The Army Family Survey contains a number of items asking how family members interact with each other. While related to family bonds, the questions fall more in the domain of intrafamily behavior. These questions were asked of the wives only. Three types of response patterns emerge from the data, as shown in Tables 9 and 10. First, while all wives respond in a generally positive manner indicating very healthy patterns of family interaction, the responses of officers' wives were significantly more positive than the responses of enlisted and NCO spouses. To almost every question listed at the top half of Table 9, officer spouses report greater family cooperation, participation, and self-expression. The second observable pattern is that for certain survey items NCO spouses report the fewest positive responses relative to those of the enlisted and officer spouses. These questions deal with "sharing interests" and "doing things together," as well as "feeling close to each other" or "being supportive of each other." While most NCO wives still agree, a significantly fewer number than the other spouses indicate that each family member has input in major family decisions. This suggests somewhat less flexibility in NCO families.

A third major finding is that a subset of family interaction questions exists on which there is general agreement across rank groups. These are shown at the bottom of Table 9. In general, most wives surveyed express equally positive attitudes to these questions, which deal with knowing each other's friends and spending free time together. Three of these latter items also deal with the family's approach to problem solving.

The same patterns of response occur for the questions that are phrased in a negative context, where an "almost never" response would be indicative of healthy family interactions. These are reported in Table 10. Officers' wives give the most positive responses, indicating for example that family members almost never avoid each other at home. About 25% of the NCO spouses responded that family members are afraid to say what is on their minds, and that family members feel closer to people outside the family. In each case, significantly more NCO spouses indicated lower quality family interactions.

Table 9

Positive Patterns of Family Interaction Where Frequency of Occurrence Indicates Success

---Where Differences Due to Rank Exist

Percentage reporting frequently or almost always:	Spouse		
	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Family members say what they want.	73	72	85'
We approve of each other's friends.	57	57	87'
Family members go along with what the family decides to do.	78	79	91'
Family members are supportive of each other during difficult times.	87	83"	94"
In our family, it is easy for everyone to express an opinion.	69	71	81'
Family members feel very close to each other.	84	79"	90"
Family members consult other family members on their decisions.	53	58	79'
Each family member has input in major family decisions.	65	54'	63
Discipline is fair in our family.	76	79	90'
Our family does things together.	84"	74"	82
Family members share interests and hobbies together.	62	56"	72"

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Table 9 (Continued)

Positive Patterns of Family Interaction Where Frequency of Occurrence Indicates Success

---Where Differences Due to Rank Do Not Exist

	Spouse
When problems arise, we compromise.	65
Our family tries new ways of dealing with problems.	50
Our family gathers together in the same room.	85
Family members know each other's close friends.	80
In our family, everyone shares responsibility.	72
Family members discuss problems and feel good about the solutions.	66
Family members like to spend their free time together.	76

Table 10

Negative Patterns of Family Interaction Where Lack of Occurrence Indicates Success

---Where Differences Due to Rank Exist

Percentage reporting almost never or once in a while:	Spouse		
	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Family members are afraid to say what is on their minds.	80	74'	84"
Family members feel closer to people outside the family than to other family members.	86	77'	87
Family members avoid each other at home.	82	85	94'
We shift household responsibilities from person to person.	53	52	39'
In solving problems, the children's suggestions are followed.	52'	34	29
We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.	63	63	78'

---Where Differences Due to Rank Do Not Exist

	Spouse
Children have a say in their discipline.	57
It is difficult to get a rule change in our family.	58
In our family, people go their own way.	83
It is easier to discuss problems with people outside the family than with other family members.	71
Family members pair up rather than do things as a family.	75
It is hard to know what the rules are in our family.	69

' = Significant difference of SP responses from MM SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

The questions for which there is agreement across the three rank groups are shown in the single column at the bottom of Table 10. Almost all the wives responded "almost never" to the statement, "In our family, people go their own way," while about half indicate that children almost never have a say in their discipline.

Findings. While all wives respond in a generally positive manner indicating very healthy patterns of family interaction, the responses of officers' wives are significantly more positive.

While the majority of NCO wives report positive attitudes, significantly fewer of these spouses indicate a sharing of interests and activities with the spouse, and feeling close to one another.

Role of the Spouse: Traditionalism vs. Egalitarianism

Family researchers have pointed out that "Members of many military families are gradually breaking the bonds of military traditions and stereotyped sex roles to develop themselves more according to their own goals, abilities, and potentials. The contemporary egalitarian family pattern contrasts dramatically with the traditional "companionate" pattern in which the military community molded family life to the requirements of the Army profession" (McCubbin & Patterson, 1983).

Table 11 presents a number of survey items that cover values or behavior associated with both family traditionalism and egalitarianism. In general Army families accept the traditional position that the husband is the leader of the family. However, these families also disagree with the traditional notion that "A woman's place is in the home" and that "The wife should not work outside the home unles it is an absolute financial necessity." Army families are more evenly split on a number of other traditionalism versus egalitarianism issues raised in the family survey, and some interesting rank group and MM vs. SP differences occur.

Wives of enlisted soldiers are more willing than NCO spouses to agree that "The wife should trust and accept the husband's judgments on important decisions." NCO spouses are in turn more willing to agree with this statement than are officers' wives. Officers and their wives differ significantly on the question of decision-making roles, with officers' wives advocating decision-making equality more than any other rank group of service members or spouses. Across all rank groups the soldiers agree that "The husband is the leader of our family," while spouses uniformly accept this viewpoint to a significantly lesser degree.

The enlisted spouses rate the importance of the soldiers' occupation higher than the soldier does, while officers' wives report (at a significantly higher level) that the wife should not work outside the home if there are young children. This more traditional view may be possible for them because of the higher income level of their spouses. An interesting finding is that all family members, regardless of rank, feel that household chores should be shared if both family members are working.

Table 11

Sex Roles in the Family Where Agreement Indicates Traditionalism

Percentage agreeing with the following statements:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
In our marriage, the husband is the leader of our family.	78 *	69	76" *	68	85" *	64
For us, the husband's occupation is always regarded as more important than the wife's.	42	47'	50 *	56	72'	65
The wife should trust and accept the husband's judgments on important decisions.	80'	75'	71'	66'	62' *	47'
If there are young children, the wife should not work outside the home.	49	42	52 *	42	61	55'

For the following, item agreement indicates egalitarianism.

Percentage agreeing with the following statement:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
If both of us are working, the husband should do the same amount of household chores as the wife.	78	82	83	84	80	84

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Table 12 presents items worded so that the respondent must disagree to express egalitarian as opposed to traditional family member role values. Officers' wives are less willing to accept the notion that wives should still be responsible for running the household if they work outside the home. Similarly, these spouses disagree with their mates as to who should have the final word on important decisions. Spouses of enlisted soldiers disagree significantly with other spouses in this regard, holding a more traditional view. They also disagree less with the notion that the wife should be more willing to go along with the husband's wishes.

Table 12

Sex Roles in the Family Where Disagreement Indicates Egalitarianism

Percentage disagreeing with the following statements:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Even if the wife works outside the home, she should still be responsible for running the household.	56	50	55	51	50 *	66'
The husband should have the final word on most of the important decisions in our family.	44"	48'	58"	60	53 *	68
In our marriage, the wife should be more willing to go along with the husband's wishes.	42'	49'	58	63	61	64
I believe that the woman's place is basically in the home.	75	73	73	76	74	70
In our family, the wife should not work outside the home unless it is an absolute financial necessity.	66 *	82	70 *	82	77	79

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Findings. Army families accept the traditional position that the husband is the leader of the family, but these families also disagree with the traditional notion that "A woman's place is in the home."

Enlisted spouses hold more traditional views than officers' wives.

The wives have more egalitarian views than the service member.

Ability of the Spouse to Cope While the Military Member Is Away

The process of managing family resources is seen as an important aspect of successful family behavior under stressful situations. The ability of Army spouses in USAREUR to cope while the military member is away on field duty or other assignments falls into this framework. In previous work (McCubbin and Patterson, 1983) it was argued that members of healthy families had both personal skills such as self-reliance, and also learned (trainable) coping skills that they developed before the family even experienced the stress or event. These families, for example, prepared for separations by actually obtaining a power of attorney and tying up all loose ends (e.g., car, home, finances, etc.) ahead of time.

The military spouse is often on her own when the MM is away from home on field duty or TDY. The ability to cope, particularly in a foreign environment, is important for marital stability and the avoidance of stress on the part of both family members. The data in Table 13 are revealing from two perspectives. First, there is a wide discrepancy between the views of the family members, particularly at the NCO level. Second, there are significant rank differences between the military members, as well as the spouses.

Across all rank groups the majority of MMs and wives indicate that the wives can cope with a short-term family separation quite well. In response to every item, spouses perceive themselves as being better able to cope during the service member's absence than do service members.

As noted, rank differences also predominate. As rank increases, a higher percentage of both the MMs and their spouses report that the wives can cope well. It may also be true that family separations are less frequent as rank increases.

Findings. Across all rank groups the majority of MMs and their wives indicate that the wives can cope with a short-term family separation quite well, though the SP is much more optimistic in this belief.

Also, as rank increases, more of the family members express confidence in the wife's ability to cope with separations.

Family Activities

Family activities, such as having dinner with friends or getting involved in recreational activities, can serve to promote physical wellness, family cohesiveness or bonding, and also the important function of expanding social networks. Family researchers suggest that social networks are an important

dimension of family resources and provide a source of emotional support for coping with stressful events. By moving beyond the basic family unit the family member can expand the base of both social support and physical resources available to deal with stressful events.

Table 13

Ability of the Wife to Cope with Short-Term Family Separations--Resiliency

Percentage reporting that spouse can do these activities okay or very well during short-term family separation:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Handle/discipline the children	76 *	89	78 *	87	85 *	91
Get the jobs done at home (cook the meals, do laundry, etc.)	82' *	94	90' *	95	96' *	100'
Get to and use Army and civilian stores and services	73'	76'	80' *	88'	92'	97'
Offer support and encouragement to children	94	98	95 *	98	95	98
Handle family finances	82" *	93	87 *	94	92" *	99'
Keep busy and do things she values and is interested in	74'	80'	86'	88'	96' *	99'
Make decisions for the family	86'	91	91'	93	99'	99'
Maintain a positive attitude toward your being away	52' *	66'	67' *	78'	79' *	94'
Handle emergencies (medical, major breakdown in household equipment, etc.)	68 *	79	75 *	83	91'	91'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

The data in Table 14 indicate that officer families are more involved in activities outside of the home than are enlisted and NCO family members. Officer family members report being more engaged in recreational activities and sports, attending courses, and going out, and also report spending less time watching TV.

Table 14

Family Activities

Percentage saying "True":	Military members		
	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
We spend most weekends and evenings at home.	63"	74"	71
Friends often come over for dinner or to visit.	49	45	42
Nobody in our family is active in sports, Little League, bowling, etc.	40"	35	27"
We often go to movies, sports events, camping, etc.	67	45'	58
Everyone in our family has a hobby or two.	72	60'	70
Family members are not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school.	50	47	32'
Family members sometimes attend courses or take lessons for some hobby or interest (outside school).	32	38	64'
Family members go out a lot.	33	32	54'
Our main form of entertainment is watching TV or listening to the radio.	72	66	40'

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

A higher percentage of NCO families spend evenings at home, do not go to the movies, and do not have hobbies. In this respect they appear less active

than enlisted families. Enlisted families, however, report the least involvement in sports activities. This lesser rate of involvement in recreational activities for the lower rank groups may be related to their financial resources and the lesser availability of recreational facilities in the more rural areas where they are located.

Findings. Officer families are more involved in activities outside the home than are either enlisted or NCO families.

NCO families appear less involved in outside activities than enlisted families, except in the area of sports.

FAMILY PARTNERSHIP WITH THE ARMY

The Army Family Action Plan (1984) states in part that

> Partnership is a cohesion of the Army and family members based on mutual understanding of the mission and commitment to each other. The purpose is to include the needs for independence and dependence existing between the family and the Army. . . . Partnership, therefore, is a reciprocal relationship, built on moral and ethical responsibilities and statutory and regulatory requirements.

Some key factors discussed in the Army Family Action Plan, which were also covered in the Army's Families in Europe Survey are (1) Reciprocal Army-family commitment, and (2) the need for families to understand the Army mission and its impact on the family. The results of this analysis reveal that Army families hold a perception or feeling of partnership with the Army, despite some misgivings. There also appears to be an acceptance of some of the problems of Army life, in return for the benefits the families derived from the Army. Several interesting trends are apparent in the data shown in Table 15. Once again rank and family member differences prevail, but not in the direction that one would expect.

While about 75% of those surveyed reported that their families shared a commitment to the lifestyle and mission of the Army, significantly more of the enlisted and NCO wives reported this family commitment than did the military member. This feeling of family commitment to the Army is even higher for officer families, with no significant difference between the officers and their spouses.

With regard to perceived reciprocal commitment of the Army to the families, the picture is essentially reversed. While Army families report a high level of commitment to the Army, they also perceive that this commitment is not reciprocated. Only about 33% of the enlisted and NCO families and half the officer families believe that "The Army treats its members and their families justly and fairly," and that "The Army really does take care of its families and wants us to be all that we can be."

More enlisted wives than soldiers feel that "The Army treats its families justly and fairly." While the enlisted and officer wives respond similarly in this regard, fewer officer spouses than officers agreed to this statement. More enlisted and NCO wives than military members also feel that the Army really does

Table 15

Family Partnership with the Army

Percentage agreeing with the following statements:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Family shares a commitment to the lifestyle and mission of the Army.	60' *	71	71' *	76	88'	84'
The Army treats its members and their families justly and fairly.	29' *	40	38'	38"	65' *	51"
Army really does take care of families and wants us to be all that we can be.	33 *	42	34 *	41	49'	49
Even though being in the Army creates hardships for us, the Army makes every effort to help us understand why.	31 *	39	35 *	40	48' *	38
Our family feels we have some say about future military assignments.	37	41	30	33	61'	54'
If we have problems or special needs in our family, we feel competent we can get the help we need.	52 *	61	55	59	74'	75'
If conflict between our family's needs and the Army's needs, there is no question that the Army comes first.	24'	25'	44	47	49	50
There is no way that being in the Army can ever be good for our family.	27'	20'	16' *	12'	06'	05'
The military member's career will be hurt if our family voices any special needs or frustrations.	52	60'	52	51	36'	43
The Army seems to dictate to spouses of military members what they should and should not do.	64	59	63	61	56	59
My family and I are unsure whether we will stay in or leave the Army.	59'	63'	44'	44	31'	37

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

take care of its families. More of the wives in all three rank groups report that the Army is "making every effort to help us understand hardships." Of special note, more enlisted spouses than military members report that if they have problems, they can find help. NCO spouses also agree less than the military members that the Army cannot be good for families. These results, while surprising, can be considered good news for the Army. The spouses apparently appreciate existing Army efforts and can be considered a major resource for maintaining a positive attitude about Army life during difficult times. The factors contributing to these feelings should be recognized and fostered by the Army.

Rank differences also play a role in the perception of partnership. The feeling of commitment by each group increases as rank increases. For example, 60% of the enlisted, 71% of the NCOs, and 88% of the officers report such a commitment. While rank differences should not be surprising, the high level of these reports of commitment presents a very positive picture. The perception of fairness also increases across groups as rank increases. The feelings of the wives, in this respect, across rank groups are somewhat more uniform. Enlisted and NCO military members are more cynical than officers about the statement that the Army really does take care of its families. Also, significantly more officers feel that the Army tries to help people understand the reason for any hardships. Enlisted families express the least agreement with the statement "In case of a conflict between Army and family needs the Army comes first." The NCO and officer families respond uniformly in this regard, with about 50% agreeing to this statement. The fact that 50% of these families feel that the Army comes first can be considered remarkable, and another sign of commitment.

Thus several factors are operating here. The relatively high commitment of the military members is significantly exceeded by the wives. There is a very strong belief that Army life can be good for families. In addition, more spouses feel that the Army is fair to families than do the service members. The positive feelings of the wives thus represent a large reservoir of good will.

Findings. Army families report a high commitment to the Army.

Army spouses report a higher commitment and more positive feelings than the military member, and feel that Army life is good for families.

At least 50% of the NCO and officer families report that the Army comes first in the case of a conflict with family needs.

The Army families do not feel, however, that their commitment is reciprocated by the Army.

SENSE OF COMMUNITY

For many service member families the Army community becomes synonymous with American culture when stationed outside of the United States. "Sense of community" can be thought of as the situation where people receive support from their environment and in turn contribute to the common good of the community. The Army Family White Paper argues that the slogan, "The Army takes care of its own" is not a promise for the institution to provide all of the

individual and group support requirements. Rather, it is a challenge for members of the Army community to work together, as equal partners, to take care of their own and improve the community as a whole (White Paper 1983--The Army Family). Following this line of thought, sense of community will be examined from the Army Family Survey data as a perception of support available from the community, and also the level of family members' involvement in caring for and improving this community.

The results for sense of community are not as positive as those for family bonds and partnership with the Army. This could be expected in view of heterogeneity of Army families and frequent moves that must be made over the course of a career. Family unity and bonds revolve around many different lifestyles and value systems. The fact that family bonds may be sustained in the Army does not assure the compatibility between different family units within an area to create a larger sense of community. Nor does the lack of compatibility between different family lifestyles detract from a sense of partnership with the Army, when such partnership is engendered by the feeling that the Army helps to sustain a desired family lifestyle or quality of life.

The results in this section are quite mixed. As can be seen in Table 16, as many people will agree with a statement as disagree. In some cases, the "unsure" response will predominate. Only one question elicits significantly different responses across each of the three rank groups, and this occurs only for the spouses. This statement is, "If I had an emergency, even people I do not know would be willing to help." The enlisted spouses are significantly more "unsure" than the NCO spouses, who in turn are significantly more "unsure" than the officer spouses. The degree of uncertainty not only differs among the spouses in different ranks, but is also significantly greater than the soldiers across all rank categories. This one question typifies the results of this section. The families are uncertain as to how well they can depend upon other community members. Mutual dependence could be considered to be a vital ingredient of sense of community. The uncertainty increases as rank decreases, and is uniformly greater for the spouses who must depend on the community to a greater extent than the soldiers. The only other clear result is that officer families, MM and SP, are more positive about sense of community across all of the questions. It should be noted as indicated in the section on demographics that officer families are more typically located in urban areas and larger military communities. Whether this is a determining factor in their responses, or the normally larger number of cultural interactions that they may have access to, is not clear.

Response differences between the MM and SP groups, when they occur, do not follow a clear pattern. One exception is that enlisted and NCO wives have a more negative view of the community as a place to raise children. NCO spouses also report a lower degree of involvement in the community than do the NCOs, but report a greater sense of security.

Findings. A strong sense of community does not exist, with only officer families expressing a more positive view.

While most officer family members report that they in turn are active and involved in their community, significantly fewer (less than half) of the enlisted and NCO families report this community involvement.

Table 16

Sense of Community

Percentage of people indicating the following responses:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
People can depend on each other in this community.						
Agree	20 *	29	21	26	57'	61'
Not sure	45	44	38 *	44	33	29'
Disagree	35 *	27	41 *	30	10'	10'
My friends in this community are part of my everyday activities.						
Agree	52	46	45	48	67'	76'
Not sure	07	10	07	08	02'	03
Disagree	41	44	48" *	44	31" *	21'
I feel useful in this community.						
Agree	34	26'	37'	34	67'	67'
Not sure	25	33	26	26	15' *	25
Disagree	41	41	37	40	18' *	08'
My role in this community is to be active and involved.						
Agree	37	30	42 *	38	57'	54'
Not sure	23 *	34'	21	24	17	17
Disagree	40	36	37	38	26'	29
Living in this community gives me a secure feeling.						
Agree	27	29	30 *	37	63'	61'
Not sure	21	25	19	22	19	18
Disagree	52	46	51 *	41	18'	21'
If I had an emergency, even people I do not know in this community would be willing to help.						
Agree	35	37	38 *	44	74'	71'
Not sure	28 *	43'	29 *	35'	13' *	21'
Disagree	37 *	20	33 *	21	13	08'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Table 16 (Continued)

Percentage of people indicating the following responses:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
People here know they can get help from the community if they are in trouble.						
Agree	33	35	38	39	62'	57'
Not sure	40'	45	32	38	27'	35
Disagree	27	20	30 *	23	11"	08'
This is not a very good community to bring children up in.						
Agree	43 *	30	39 *	31	20'	21'
Not sure	26	31	23	26	19	20
Disagree	31	39	38 *	43	61'	59'
There is a feeling in this community that people should not get too friendly with each other.						
Agree	45	42	52 *	46	14'	15'
Not sure	28	30	23	24	30	29
Disagree	27	28	25	30	56'	56'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

NCO family members hold significantly different views on many of the community support issues investigated, with the wife typically taking a more positive outlook.

QUALITY OF LIFE

For this paper "Quality of Life" will be examined as a function of both quality of family life, and also quality of community support. Quality of family life information is gained from survey items such as time for family togetherness, job satisfaction, opportunity for travel, financial security, quality of friendships, and quality of the marital relationship. With regard to community support, the quality of services such as the PX, commissary, medical and dental services, Army community services, recreation programs, youth activities, and clubs will be examined.

Quality of life will first be addressed in terms of family life; what the families expected to experience in USAREUR compared to what has actually happened. Second, we present the family life changes that have occurred since coming to USAREUR, compared to the last assignment. The third section examines changes in community support; USAREUR vs. last assignment. The final section provides some basic "bottom line" information on quality of life, the family members' reported satisfaction with key aspects of Army family life in USAREUR.

Experiences Relative to Expectations About USAREUR

As shown in Table 17, relatively few individuals report finding life in USAREUR to be better than they expected. Rank differences occur only for "The opportunity to travel in Europe," where about one third of the officer families report that their experiences exceeded their expectations. Differences between perceptions of the MMs and wives occur very frequently for the NCO families. Here, the wives generally report a more positive view, though the quality of life expectations for both NCO service members and spouses are seldom exceeded.

Table 17

Family Life Experiences in USAREUR That Were Better Than Expected

Percentage reporting better than expected:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Quality housing for the family	19	28'	14 *	18'	19	21
Quality school for the kids	11	10	17 *	12	20 *	13
Time for family togetherness	7	7	6 *	9	12'	14
A job I really liked	8'	9'	14' *	19	22'	22
Increases chances of advancement and promotion for the military member	8	9	12	13	10	9
Chance to travel in Europe	14	16	17 *	21	28'	37'
Chance for family to enjoy and appreciate living in a foreign country	15	12	13	11	14	16
Financial security and stability	13	20	15 *	20	18	24

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

From Table 18 it can be seen that most family life experience item responses fall into the "Worse than expected" response category. For seven of the nine questions clear rank differences occur. For each of these items, as rank decreases the number reporting that their experiences were worse than expected increases. This is generally true for both the MM and SP, with some exceptions. About two thirds of the enlisted families report being particularly disappointed in terms of time for family togetherness, a job I really liked, and increased chances of advancement and promotion for the MM. Where family differences occur within ranks, the disappointment is greater for the MM. The most revealing finding in this set of data is the great extent to which expectations were not met for the enlisted personnel, and to a lesser extent for the NCOs.

Table 18

Family Life Experiences in USAREUR That Were Worse Than Expected

Percentage reporting worse than expected:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Quality housing for the family	32	27	32	28	25	26
Quality school for the kids	24	27	22	24	19	22
Time for family togetherness	73' *	61'	55' *	46'	33'	29'
A job I really liked	60' *	50'	46' *	33	29'	27
Increased chances of advancement and promotion for the military member	60'	57'	31'	30'	10'	13'
Chance to travel in Europe	44'	44'	33' *	25	17'	19
Chance for family to enjoy and appreciate living in a foreign country	47' *	37'	33' *	26'	14'	10'
Quality medical/dental service for family	39	43'	37'	33'	23'	22'
Financial security and stability	30	24'	24 *	17'	3'	3'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Findings. Only about 10% to 20% of Army families surveyed found aspects of life in USAREUR to be better than they expected it to be. Here, officer families differed from the others in that their travel opportunities in Europe exceeded their expectations more often.

For most Army families in USAREUR, their experiences proved to be worse than expected. As rank decreases, this number increases. Where family differences occur, disappointment is greater for the MM. The greatest disappointments cited concerned time for family togetherness and job satisfaction.

Community Life in USAREUR Relative to Previous Assignment

The survey respondents were asked, "Compared to life in your last assignment before coming to Europe, how is life now in USAREUR?" with regard to 27 aspects of Army community life. Only the responses for individuals who reported "Much better than" and "Much worse than" are presented in Tables 19 and 20, i.e., those aspects of community life in USAREUR that appear to be an advantage and those that are problems, respectively. The data in Table 21 combine the "Just as good as" and "Much better than" responses into a basic quality of life measure and essentially indicate how many of the Army families are satisfied with the separate aspects of USAREUR community life.

The information in Table 19 is presented to indicate what aspects of community life are considered to be an advantage ("Much better than" previous assignment) and how many of the families feel this way. Generally, fewer than 20% of those surveyed report that any of the areas covered represent an advantage to life in USAREUR. An exception to this is that amount of crime in the community or safety from crime is seen as better by many respondents to be an advantage to life in USAREUR. Results indicate that officer families are more optimistic than others with respect to "Being able to travel" (74%) and "Eating out with the family and friends" (45%). About 30% of the officer families also report that cost of living in USAREUR is "Much better than" in their last assignment. Beyond these, few rank differences are found, with the exceptions that significantly more enlisted spouses indicate that they are pleased about their housing, neighborhood, and the quality of the children's education.

In contrast, the data from Table 20 reveal the disadvantages to life in USAREUR. A higher percentage of the respondents report that the community life they experience in USAREUR is "Much worse than" it was in the last assignment, across almost all the community life items considered. The exceptions here are that opportunity for travel, amount of crime, and quality of marital relationship are not viewed as USAREUR-related problems. Where significant rank differences occur, the dissatisfaction is greater as rank decreases. The only exception is in the area of housing, where dissatisfaction increases significantly for spouses of higher ranking military members. Differences between family members occur primarily for NCO families, with the spouses expressing less dissatisfaction than the military member.

Time available to spend with children is a key concern, and it should be noted that in some areas high school students must live in dormitories in a distant city during the week and are bused "home" on weekends. The majority of respondents also indicate that the fear of family members being caught in a war is much worse in USAREUR. About half of the enlisted and officer family

Table 19

Community Life Experiences in USAREUR Rated Much Better Than the Previous Assignment

Percentage indicating better than:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Family						
Your present housing	25"	33'	16"	16	19	13
Your present neighborhood	21	24'	14	12	15	13
Cost of living	14	19	15	17	29'	27'
Being able to travel and see new places	34	30	35	37	74'	74'
Opportunity to eat out with the family and friends	19	13	15	18	44'	45'
Children's happiness	11	10	8	10	9	6
Spouse's happiness	14	23	15	15	15	14
Amount of time parents have with their children	6	9	6	10	9	9
Chances for spouse to find a job	10'	16	20	19	18	21
Quality of children's education	18	25'	14	12	8	7
Quality and number of friendships	12	14	9	11	9 *	17
Fear that family members will be caught in war	11 *	2	13 *	6	11	4
Number of financial problems	17	24	24 *	30	21	29
Amount of crime	41	50	34	38'	42	49
Quality of marital relationship	26	31	22	21	14'	20

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Table 20

Community Life Experiences in USAREUR Rated Much Worse Than the Previous Assignment

Percentage indicating much worse than:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Family						
Your present housing	35'	28'	47 *	39'	55	53'
Your present neighborhood	28	27	37	34	34	30
Cost of living	36	34	36 *	29	17' *	8'
Being able to travel and see new places	31	29'	24 *	19'	9' *	2'
Opportunity to eat out with the family and friends	31	35'	26	26'	9'	8'
Children's happiness	26	24	28	28	20	19
Spouse's happiness	45	41	38	35	26'	19'
Amount of time parents have with their children	53	46	54 *	41	39'	32
Chances for spouse to find a job	52	56'	39'	37	50	39
Quality of children's education	30	34	26 *	32	31	36
Quality and number of friendships	30	38	29	30	19	12'
Fear that family members will be caught in war	62 *	73'	51'	57	62	53
Number of financial problems	29 *	22	26 *	17	9'	6'
Amount of crime	11	11	17 *	12	10 *	5
Quality of marital relationship	19	21'	16	14'	8'	6'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

members feel that job opportunities for wives are much worse in USAREUR, with enlisted family wives seeing this lack of job opportunity as being more of a problem than do the other wives. Less than one third of the families see cost of living and financial problems as being much worse in USAREUR. In general, only about 10% respond that crime is much worse in USAREUR.

Having identified what is much better and what is much worse about community life in USAREUR, a measure of the general quality of life that currently exists was derived. The figures in Table 21 represent the opinion that life in USAREUR is just as good as, or better than in the previous assignment. This is a basic quality of life indicator showing the percentage of the survey sample that is basically satisfied with each aspect of community life. When this general quality of life is considered, a somewhat different picture emerges. The pattern of the data in Table 21 indicates that with some exceptions the majority of military families report quality of community life to be just as good as or better than their previous assignment. To highlight the findings, quality of marital relationships, number of friendships, children's education and happiness are all reported to be just as good or better in USAREUR than in the previous assignment by the vast majority. Similarly, opportunity to travel and eat out in USAREUR are rated highly by 60% or more of the families. When rank differences occur, attitudes are generally more positive for the officer families. A greater percentage of the enlisted military members are pleased with their USAREUR housing, while the officer's spouse is the least pleased compared to other wives. Significant rank differences also occur in the military member's perception of his spouse's happiness, as positive perceptions again increase with rank. Opinion differences between family members occur most often for the NCO families, where the perceptions of the wives are generally more positive, except for their greater fear of family members being caught in war, and lower opinion of children's education. Both the enlisted and NCO military members are much less satisfied than their spouses about the amount of time they have to spend with their children.

Findings. Considering advantages to life in USAREUR, fewer than 20% of those surveyed report that a particular aspect of USAREUR community life is "much better" than it was in the previous assignment, i.e., an advantage.

Three community life areas in particular are seen as being "much worse" in USAREUR by about half of all respondents (with some rank differences): the amount of time parents have with children, chances for the wife to find a job, and fear that family members will be caught in a war.

With regard to general satisfaction, the majority of families surveyed indicate that the quality of community life in USAREUR is "equal to or better than" their previous assignment, i.e., they are basically satisfied. Where rank differences occur, attitudes are generally more positive for the officer families.

Community Support Services in USAREUR Relative to Those of Previous Assignment

A very basic question in assessing quality of life in USAREUR is to consider how community support, both physical facilities (like the PX) and support services (such as Army Community Services programs (ACS) in USAREUR, compares

Table 21

Quality of Community Life in USAREUR Compared to Previous Assignment

Percentage indicating USAREUR just as good as/much better than CONUS:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Your present housing	58'	65	48 *	55	40	43'
Your present neighborhood	57	63	54 *	60	63	65
Cost of living	35 *	47	40 *	52	67'	76'
Being able to travel and see new places	60"	65"	70"	75"	89" *	97"
Opportunity to eat out with the family and friends	60	59	67	67	89'	91'
Children's happiness	64	71	68	69"	77	82"
Spouse's happiness	46"	53	57"	59	74"	79'
Amount of time parents have with their children	26 *	43	38 *	51	48'	54
Chances for spouse to find a job	34'	31'	47	48	44	50
Quality of children's education	60	64	69 *	62	63	60
Quality and number of friendships	60	58	65	63	79'	85
Fear that family members will be caught in a war	25 *	12'	38' *	25	24	32
Number of financial problems	46 *	59	53 *	61	75'	77'
Amount of crime	60	70	57	59'	64 *	75
Quality of marital relationship	76	80	80	80	88' *	93'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

to that offered in the previous assignment, typically CONUS. The basic question is again "Compared to life in your last assignment before coming to Europe, how is life now in USAREUR?" The responses for individuals who reported "Much better than" and "Much worse than" are presented in Tables 22 and 23, i.e., those aspects of community support in USAREUR that represent an improvement or a reduction in support, respectively. The figures in Table 24 represent the opinion that the community support available in USAREUR is just as good as or better than in the previous assignment.

Table 22

Community Support Services Rated Much Better Than the Previous Assignment

Percentage indicating much better than:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Community						
PX	9	4	10	9	11	15'
Commissary	8	8	9	9	10	11
Medical/dental services	11 *	15	12 *	16	13	18
Quality of Army Community Services program	13	12	11"	11	19"	16
Quality of recreation programs (theaters, gyms, crafts, etc.)	7	7	7	6	13'	12
Youth activities	7	13	10	11	12 *	23'
Use of NCO/Officers' Clubs	7	9	11	13	16	13
Quality of chaplain program	22	13	14 *	8	18 *	11
Quality of church/synagogue services and activities	14	13	7	6	13	7
Child care services	9	15	5	7'	8	17

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Table 23

Community Support Services Rated Much Worse Than the Previous Assignment

Percentage indicating much worse than:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Community						
PX	68	66	61	60	49'	39'
Commissary	61	64	60	58	49	42'
Medical/dental service	40	43	41	37	26'	27'
Quality of Army Community Service program	30	28	23	21	9'	9'
Quality of recreation programs (theaters, gyms, crafts, etc.)	52	51"	52 *	42	45	36"
Youth activities	32	29	33	33	39	37
Use of NCO/Officers' Clubs	42"	39	36 *	28	28"	34
Quality of chaplain program	14	16	11	12	13	22
Quality of churches/synagogues services and activities	18	27	17	19	19	21
Child care services	50	50	47 *	33	44	33

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Table 24

Quality of Community Support in USAREUR Compared to the Previous Assignment

Percentage indicating just as good as/much better than CONUS:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
USAREUR Support						
PX	27	30	32	35	44' *	54'
Commissary	28	31	34	37	42	51'
Medical/dental services	40	49	50	54	64'	67'
Quality of Army Community Services program	59	68	63	67	81'	89'
Quality of recreation programs (theaters, gyms, crafts, etc.)	38	45	39 *	50	53	60
Youth activities program	55	60	58	57	55	63
Use of NCO/Officers' Clubs	36' *	52	50 *	60	58	50
Quality of chaplain program	76	75	79	77	81	74
Quality of church/synagogue services and activities	70	69	75	73	79	74
Child care services	41	41	38	44	38 *	55

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

As can be seen in Table 22, relatively few individuals consider community support services to be "Much better than" in the previous assignment. Any percentage, however low, can be considered a bonus though since the services are being provided overseas. The percentage of families indicating that community support is "Much worse" than before is quite high. Table 23 shows that where rank differences occur, the reduced support problem is significantly greater for the enlisted families. It should be kept in mind that the enlisted and NCO families are typically located in the more rural areas. The smaller military communities in these areas do not have the same resources as the larger military communities, where a larger percentage of higher ranking military personnel are located.

Response differences between rank groups were not found for the community support issues. This is consistent with previous Army Family Survey work (Ozkaptan, Sanders, & Holz, in press) which found that an equal percentage of families in each rank group holds a negative attitude about being in USAREUR that is pervasive across many issues on the receptiveness of Army families in USAREUR to incentives for extension.

When the responses of "Just as good" or "Much better than" are combined into a general satisfaction indicator, some community support services fare quite well, as can be seen in Table 24. Most families indicate satisfaction with the quality of chaplain programs and services, and Army Community Services programs. Problem areas identified are the PX, commissaries, and child care services. Once again dissatisfaction in these areas increases as rank decreases.

Findings. Relatively few individuals consider community support services to be much better than in their previous assignment. In contrast, many families indicate that community support services are much worse. This reduced support problem is significantly worse for the enlisted families.

When responses of "Just as good" and "Much better than" are combined as a general indicator of satisfaction, the chaplain programs and Army Community Services fare quite well. The PX, commissaries, and child care services appear to be problem areas.

Satisfaction

A "bottom line" on quality of life in USAREUR is provided by global measures of satisfaction presented in Table 25. Satisfaction with family life, Army life, and housing generally reflects the overall trends reported for expectations about USAREUR, and perceived changes in community life and community support. Most Army families report that they are satisfied with their family life in USAREUR. As rank increases, significantly more military members report being satisfied with their family life, with twice as many officers expressing this opinion than enlisted members. Significantly more of the officers' wives group also report being satisfied with family life than do wives of enlisted personnel and NCOs. More of these enlisted and NCO wives in turn report being satisfied with family life than do the enlisted and NCO service members.

Considering satisfaction with Army life, significant rank differences occur for both the military members and wives. Only about 30% of the enlisted family members report being satisfied with Army life in USAREUR, while about 42% of the NCO families and 73% of the officer families report satisfaction. The relatively low job satisfaction of the enlisted and NCOs may generalize to other attitudes regarding USAREUR.

Most family members report that they are satisfied with their USAREUR housing. Rank differences do not occur, and only the NCO wives and soldiers groups differ, with more reporting satisfaction with housing. It should be noted that significantly more NCO wives report satisfaction across all three global satisfaction items than do the NCOs.

Table 25

Key Elements of Family Satisfaction in USAREUR

Percentage satisfied or very satisfied:	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
How satisfied are you with each of the following:						
Your family life in USAREUR	42' *	61	55' *	64	82'	79'
Army life (job, mission, rules, etc.) in USAREUR	31'	35'	42' *	49'	73'	73'
Your housing in USAREUR	58	66	51 *	61	51	59

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

It was reported earlier in this section that the officers' wives group reported significantly more negative attitudes than other wives and soldiers rank groups when asked to compare USAREUR housing to that of the last assignment. When asked to simply rate their satisfaction with USAREUR housing, however, their responses are more positive and do not differ from the other rank groups. Perhaps the officers' wives group does experience more of a step-down in terms of past vs. present housing, but in terms of their present attitude they seem to accept USAREUR housing limitations just like the enlisted and NCO wives groups.

Findings. Most Army families report that they are satisfied with their family life in USAREUR, and this increases significantly as rank increases. More enlisted and NCO wives say they are satisfied with family life than do the service members in these rank groups.

Significant rank differences occur for satisfaction with Army life, as more than twice as many officer families than enlisted report being satisfied members.

Most family members report that they are satisfied with their USAREUR housing.

ADAPTATION TO USAREUR

The PCS move and adaptation to USAREUR present the Army family with a stressful but common part of Army family life. For careerists it will likely be a recurring event. The mission-essential nature of this activity allows for the focus on perfecting a PCS and USAREUR adaptation system to recognize both problems and available supports. A great deal of information was gathered in the Army Family Survey on adaptation to USAREUR in four key areas. First, the predeployment experience was considered to determine whether particular features of "moving-out" constitute a big problem to families. Second, the family's experiences during the first 3 months following their arrival in USAREUR were examined to identify where problems might be occurring during the "moving-in" process. Next, the factors which might serve to compensate families for PCS hardships and thus aid family adjustment in USAREUR were considered, such as the sponsor, past personal experience, and the prospect of travel in Europe. The fourth area examined families' cultural skills in USAREUR, and provides a measure of the specialized adaptation or coping resources the families possess.

Predeployment Experiences

Adaptation to USAREUR begins with the PCS-related movement activities in CONUS. A difficult experience leaving CONUS can create bad felings about USAREUR even before the Army family arrives. Army family members were asked whether any of 15 key PCS elements presented problems to the family. Data for those who indicated that aspects of preparation for the move created a "Big" or "Very major problem" are reported in Table 26.

Overall, six areas were described as problems by 30% or more of the respondents for a rank group. About one third of all families indicated that leaving relatives or close friends behind, and packing and shipping goods represented either a big or very major problem. Over 40% of the enlisted personnel and NCOs indicated that having to move their families around in CONUS while waiting for USAREUR housing presented them with problems. About one third of the enlisted personnel and NCOs also said that borrowing money to cover travel had been a big problem, while only 5% of the officers cited this as a problem. Difficulties selling or renting the family home were reported primarily by the officers.

For three survey items, significant rank differences occurred only between the officer and NCO rank groups, with the NCOs reporting the most problems and the officers the least problems. The items were "family member had to give up job," "leave an educational program before completing it," and "interrupting special educational or medical programs." While these aspects of the PCS move are problems for a smaller percentage of the respondents, they are important due to the fact that they are specific to a rank group.

For four items the enlisted and NCO military members reported significantly more problems than the officers. These items were "Having to move family to another home in CONUS while waiting for housing in USAREUR or authorization to travel," "Having to borrow money to cover moving costs," getting passports and immunizations, and leaving children behind for school. Of these, multiple moves had the highest percentage of responses for the enlisted and

Table 26

Problems with Permanent Change of Station to USAREUR

Percentage reporting "Big problems" or "Very major problems":	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Hard to get rid of or relocate a pet because of restrictions or choose to leave a pet behind	13"	18	26"
Hard to sell or rent out family home	05'	15'	32'
Hard to sell or ship a car	25	29	25
Hard to move family to another home in CONUS while waiting for housing in USAREUR or authorization to travel	47	41	27'
Hard to borrow money to cover travel or moving costs	31	30	05'
Family member had to give up job	25	28"	17"
Family member had to leave educational program before completing it	16	23"	11"
Family member had to give up involvement in a valued activity (e.g., club, sports, etc.)	12	16	13
Had to interrupt medical/dental treatment or special educational program for a family member	17	20"	09'
Getting a passport and immunizations	28	21	22'
Getting a port call (location, seat, and time)	24	20	19
Packing and shipping our goods	26	28	33
Leaving relatives behind	44	34	32
Leaving close friends behind	32	27	25
Leaving children behind for school and other special reasons	15	16	6'

' = Significant difference of SP responses from MM responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

NCOs (47% and 41%, respectively). Of the remaining five items, the problems were equally shared among the rank groups, including the selling or shipping of a car.

The most serious problems over which the Army has some control are the high percentage of NCOs and enlisted personnel who had to make multiple moves, the need to borrow money to cover moving costs, and problems getting passports or immunizations. The financial burdens placed on an Army family during a move have been recognized in the past. This problem is also compounded by the need to relocate the family more than once. The reported problems of giving up a job or an educational or medical program are not readily traceable to Army policies, with the exception of giving as much advance notice as possible of a family's PCS to USAREUR.

Findings. About 30% of all families indicated that leaving relatives or close friends behind, and packing and shipping goods posed a problem.

Over 40% of the enlisted personnel and NCOs cited having to move families around in CONUS while waiting for USAREUR housing as a major problem they faced.

About 30% of the enlisted personnel and NCOs also indicated that borrowing money to cover travel had been a problem associated with the PCS, while only 5% of the officers indicated that they had this problem.

Experiences upon Arrival in USAREUR

The family's experiences during the first 3 months following arrival in USAREUR were examined to identify where problems might be occurring during the moving-in process. Wives were asked how much of a problem each of 12 separate aspects of moving-in presented to the family. A key notion is that this time-frame constitutes "first impressions" and will strongly influence the attitude the family takes toward living in USAREUR for the duration of the tour.

The data in Table 27 show the percentage of wives indicating that an aspect of the moving-in experience constituted a "big or very major problem" to the family. Wives in each of the three rank groups provided significantly different responses for 3 of the 12 adaptation items. Enlisted wives reported the most problems, with over 40% indicating that getting permanent housing and frequent separations due to field duty constituted problems, while one third reported problems with learning the language and social customs of Germany. At least part of the reason that NCO wives have less trouble with language and social customs is the fact that 19% are German by birth.

For six adaptation items the enlisted and NCO wives acted similarly, reporting significantly more problems than the officers' wives. The most noteworthy of these are "more than one move before getting permanent assignment," "having to buy new household goods," and "not getting paid on time."

More NCO wives (about one third) reported that moving costs presented a problem than did the other rank groups. Overall, about one fourth of all the wives indicated that delays in arrival of, or damage to, hold baggage or household goods constituted a big or very major problem during the family's first 3 months in USAREUR.

Table 27

Problems Experienced Following Arrival in USAREUR

Percentage reporting "Big" or "Very big" problem:	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Long delay in arrival of or damage to hold baggage or household goods	18	21	21
Costs of moving and getting settled were greater than expected	23	29"	17"
Did not get paid on time	16	14	3'
Couldn't get or had a long delay in getting a driver's license	16'	7	3
Had difficulty with obtaining auto (picking up at port, passing inspection, registering, etc.)	11	8	2'
Long delay in getting assigned to or finding permanent housing	42'	33'	18'
Had to buy new household goods/equipment because of differences in USAREUR	26	20	12'
Military member had long and/or frequent separations from family due to field duty, TDY, etc.	49'	36'	23'
Learning the language and social customs of Germany or Italy	33'	23'	11'
Learning the telephone and transportation systems here	24	18	8'
Learning the traffic laws and regulations here	12	14"	5"
More than one move before getting permanent housing	19	16	6'

' = Significant difference of MM responses from SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Findings. The two most frequent problems experienced during the moving-in process are family separations due to field duty or TDY, etc., and long delays getting permanent housing. These two areas posed problems for about half of all the enlisted wives, one third of the NCOs, and one quarter of the officers' wives.

The third-largest problem area cited by the wives concerned learning the language and social customs of Germany. A third of the enlisted wives found this to be a problem, but this decreased significantly as rank increased.

Aids to Adjustment in USAREUR

Many efforts are made to reduce the stressfulness of the PCS move. While not directly resolving the stressful event, a number of factors can instead serve to compensate for the problems encountered by mentally preparing the family members, providing social or emotional support, or offering a valued reward for having gone through the stressful activity. The "helpfulness" of 10 very different "aids" to adjustment in USAREUR, such as the sponsor, past experience, and the prospect of travel in Europe, was evaluated in the Army Family Survey. Specifically, wives were asked "How much did each of the following (10 items) help you adjust to your arrival in USAREUR?" Table 28 presents the percentages of wives responding that a particular "aid" was either helpful or very helpful.

Table 28

Aids to Adjustment in USAREUR

Percentage reporting helpful or very helpful	Spouse		
	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Preorientation information	42	52	76'
Our sponsor	51	42"	60"
Co-worker and job	47'	60'	85'
Neighbors	66	63	88'
Personal attitude	83	86	93'
Church group	63	52	64
Support of spouse and family	95	92"	99"
Previous experience	68'	84	92
Opportunity to travel	71	77	94'
Opportunity to live in European culture	75	78	90'

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

"Support of spouse and family" was cited most frequently, 92% to 99%, by all rank groups as having been helpful in adjusting to USAREUR. Considering the reported problems during PCS, family strengths and resiliency are critical for coping with PCS demands. Any programs that support family bonds contribute in turn to a family's ability to cope with Army PCS demands. Another important coping factor included is "personal attitude." Officers' wives more often cite "personal attitude" as a factor aiding in adjustment to USAREUR than do other wives, although this perception is generally held across ranks, ranging from 83% to 93% of the wives.

The two factors least often cited as being helpful in adjusting to USAREUR are "our sponsor," and "preorientation information." Only about 50% of the wives report that "our sponsor" was helpful, with significantly fewer NCO wives taking this position. Additional information on sponsor support appears in the section on Family Problems and Concerns. Similarly, only about half of the enlisted and NCO wives felt that preorientation information had been helpful.

Significant response differences occur among the three rank groups for only one question. As rank increases, reported support of "co-workers and job" increases. For 5 of the 10 questions, a significantly higher number of officers' wives respond that they found the particular factors to be helpful than did the spouses in the other rank groups. These items are preorientation information, neighbors, personal attitude, and opportunity to travel and live in a foreign culture. Most wives across all ranks generally view these five factors as being helpful. As would be expected, fewer enlisted wives cite previous experience as having been helpful in their adjustment to USAREUR.

Findings. "Support of spouse and family" was cited most frequently, 92% to 99%, by all rank groups as having been helpful in adjusting to USAREUR.

With regard to the least helpful "aids," only about half of the wives cited "our sponsor" or "preorientation information" as being helpful in adjusting to USAREUR.

Cultural Skills Possessed by Family Members in USAREUR

The possession of cultural skills in USAREUR serves as one indication of the coping resources the family possesses. Both military members and their wives were asked to report how well they could carry out nine activities, such as speaking the German language, using public transportation, and shopping on the local economy, which require particular cultural skills. Specifically, families were asked "Since coming to USAREUR, to what degree are you now able to do the following things?" Table 29 presents the percentage of family members responding that they could carry out a particular activity "well" or "very well."

About 25% of the family members across all ranks report the ability to speak the German language well or very well, with the exception of the wives of the enlisted military members, where only 17% report this ability. With the exception of language knowledge, the majority of family members indicate that they can do the activities requiring cultural skills well or very well. It is interesting to note that 84% to 97% of the respondents indicate that they do well shopping on the German economy, despite the relatively low percentage

reporting their ability to speak German well. Apparently the English-language skills of Germans are helping to bridge this gap to some degree. Despite the language barrier the families report that they are getting out and about.

Table 29

Cultural Skills Possessed by Family Members in USAREUR

Percentage reporting well or use well:	Enlisted		NCOs		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Speak the German language	24	17'	28	27	26	26
Drive a car in USAREUR	76' *	37'	90' *	53'	99' *	89'
Use public transportation in Germany	64' *	50'	72 *	60'	88' *	76'
Use the German telephone system	78	72	83 *	78	89'	87'
Order food from a local restaurant in Europe	73 *	54'	79 *	63'	93'	89'
Understand German customs and laws	76 *	56'	75 *	65'	86'	85'
Use the German postal system	51' *	41'	64' *	51'	83'	84'
Use the train system in Europe	63' *	35'	72' *	47'	86' *	68'
Shop on the economy	88	84	87	85	95'	97'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

For four of the nine skills significant rank group differences occur among military members, and also among their wives, where skills increase with rank. The particular skills involve using public transportation, the train system, and the postal system, and driving a car. The latter skill is naturally associated with the availability of financial resources to own and use a car. The other skill differences may also be tied to the reduced availability of these services in the more rural areas of the country, where the majority of enlisted and NCO families are located.

Response differences occurred between wives' rank groups for the two items "Understanding German customs and laws" and "Ordering food in local restaurants." These differences may again be related to rank group differences in financial resources and access to transportation, which could limit lower ranking families' contact with the local German community. Rank-related demographic characteristics such as education and USAREUR experience would also be logical contributing factors.

Findings. About 25% of all the family members report the ability to speak the German language well or very well. The one exception to this is that significantly fewer enlisted wives (17%) report this ability.

With the exception of language knowledge, the majority of all family members indicate that they can do the activities requiring cultural skills either well or very well.

FAMILY PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS

It has been argued by Gonzales (1970) that "The military family is influenced by a host of acute and chronic stresses related to, if not unique to, life in the military," and that "No other large group is exposed so uniformly to the pressures of father absence and geographical mobility" (in McCubbin & Patterson, 1983). Problems of families in USAREUR occur for many reasons. Some are caused by aspects of the Army mission, some can be linked to life in the USAREUR community, and others will be a function of family life. The present section will identify some problems and concerns associated with Army family life in USAREUR, specifically addressing Army-related problems, family-centered problems, and concerns influencing plans for tour extension and sponsor support.

Army Mission-Related Family Problems

Family problems occur for many reasons. Some are caused by aspects of life in the Army, some by being in USAREUR, and others are a function of family lifestyles and degree of harmony. Army-related problems are shown in Table 30. Of note is the high percentage of enlisted and NCO family member agreement to the statements that family and work schedules are always up in the air due to frequent TDYs, long hours, etc., and "Our family is unsure when the military member will be home or gone." Overall, about two thirds of these enlisted and NCO family members also report that Army life makes planning for family members' education and work almost impossible, and that they cannot plan in advance for military assignments. Once again, officer families report the fewest problems in this regard. Where significant differences occur between service member and spouse groups, it is the spouse group that takes the more positive view. Officer spouses, however, feel more negatively than do the officers about being able to plan for future assignments.

Findings. Enlisted and NCO family members feel that Army life makes planning for family members' education and work almost impossible.

The enlisted and NCO spouses have a more positive view than the service member about Army problems.

Table 30

Army Mission-Related Family Problems

Percentage agreeing with the following statements:	Enlisted			NCOs			Officer		
	MM		SP	MM		SP	MM		SP
Army life makes planning for family members' education and work almost impossible.	71	*	61	68	*	61	44'		52
Our family can pretty well plan in advance for military assignments in the Army.	31		35	30	*	39	51'	*	37
Our work and family schedules are always up in the air because of frequent TDYs, long work hours, etc.	81		79'	78	*	71'	57'		60'
Our family is unsure when our active duty member will be home or gone.	78		79	70		73	48'		53'

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Personal Problems Experienced by Army Family Members in USAREUR

The Army Family Survey presented a 10-item checklist of possible family problem events and asked the military member whether any of these problems had occurred for a family member (Yes/No) during the previous 3 months. The percentage figures in Table 31 represent the "Yes" responses for each item, indicating that the particular problem occurred at least once for any one of the family members over the past 3 months. The data are thus limited in that they cannot convey an indication of the actual frequency of the problem event within a family and of how many members were affected.

The four problem areas for which the rank group responses do not differ significantly involve visiting the hospital as an outpatient, being admitted to a hospital for treatment, having a minor personal injury, and having trouble with the police. Over three fourths of all those surveyed indicated that some member of their family had been hospitalized as an outpatient. About 15% to 20% of the military members also indicated that a family member had been

admitted to the hospital for treatment or had an accident not requiring medical treatment. It is difficult to interpret the large outpatient trend as this behavior could involve instances as minor as getting aspirin. Similarly, the 15% to 20% treatment and minor accident rate for a family over a 3-month period is not obviously high or low by itself.

Table 31

Personal Problems Experienced by Army Family Members in USAREUR

Percentage saying "Yes" during past 3 months:	Military member		
	Enlisted	NCO	Officer
Visited a dispensary/hospital as an outpatient for an illness	72	70	78
Been admitted to the hospital for treatment	22	15	14
Had an accident involving a personal injury that did NOT require medical treatment	17	17	21
Sought professional help (chaplain, counselor, etc.) for a marital or family problem	12"	8	5"
Taken any steps for a marital separation or divorce	3	5"	1"
Had difficulty paying bills	34	27	8"
Had a problem with anger and physically abused another	13"	9	4"
Had a problem with overuse of alcohol or use of drugs	16'	10'	3'
Considered or attempted suicide	3	5"	1"
Been in trouble with the German, Italian, or military police	3	2	1

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

The reports of problems encountered by Army families do differ significantly as a function of family rank group for 6 of the 10 problem events examined. For four of the six areas, reports of problems decrease as rank increases. About 30% of the enlisted personnel and NCOs say that they have had difficulty paying bills in the last 3 months--significantly more than for the officer group. Each rank group differs significantly in the use of drugs/alcohol in the previous 3 months. Enlisted and officer military members differ in terms of reported anger/physical abuse problems and seeking help for marital or family problems, with about 13% of the enlisted personnel and 4% of the officers indicating these problems. Less than 3% of all the military members report that family members have had trouble with the police during the previous 3 months.

NCOs and officers differ significantly with regard to suicidal thoughts or behavior, and the initiation of marital separation or divorce. However, only 5% of the NCOs and 1% of the officers report these problems. Earlier in Table 20 it was reported that the fear that "family members will be caught in a war" is much worse in USAREUR. This fear is not offset by any great confidence in the "Noncombatant Evacuation Operations" (NEO) program. As can be seen in Table 32, fewer than half of the families feel NEO will protect them. It should be noted that faith in NEO decreases as rank increases. Significant rank differences occur for the alternate response of "no" or "never heard of NEO," with 10% of the enlisted families giving the latter response.

Table 32

Family Members' Faith in Noncombatant Evacuation Operations (NEO)

Do you think NEO will protect you and your family?	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Yes	49	50	38 *	46	37	38
No	39' *	23'	59 *	39'	63	54'
Never heard of NEO	10'	12'	2 *	5	0	1

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

Findings. Over three fourths of all those surveyed indicated that there had been family member outpatient treatment within the prior 3 months.

For four of the six areas where rank groups differ, reports of problems decrease as rank increases. In particular, about 30% of the enlisted personnel

and NCOs indicate difficulties paying bills, a rate significantly higher than that for the officer group.

Fewer than half of the Army families surveyed feel that NEO will protect them. Unlike most problem areas, faith in NEO decreases as rank increases.

Problems Influencing Plans for Extension

A bottom line measure of adjustment to Army life in USAREUR is the question of whether the family would choose to remain in USAREUR voluntarily. Data from two survey items were combined in Table 3 yielding an answer to the basic question for the military member, "Would you extend on your present tour if you had the chance?" Similarly, wives were asked if the family would be supportive/encourage the military member to extend his present USAREUR tour.

Table 33

Problems Influencing Plans for Tour Extension

	Enlisted		NCO		Officer	
	MM	SP	MM	SP	MM	SP
Would you extend on your present tour if you had the chance?						
Yes	10' *	28'	18' *	40	34' *	47
Maybe, but only for an incentive	59' *	25	47' *	24	36' *	21
No, not even for an incentive	25	28	32 *	25	29	26
What one thing would stop you from extending?						
Family reasons	24	25	27	31	54'	48'
Job reasons	41 *	11	39 *	14	31 *	10
Cost of living here	7	10	6 *	9	1'	3'
Don't like Europe	5	8	7"	5	2"	1'
Personal reasons	7 *	22	12 *	23	10 *	24
"Nothing--I'm getting out"	10'	8	4 *	6	2	5

* = Significant difference between MM and SP responses within the same rank group.

' = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from MM or SP responses in the other rank groups.

" = Significant difference of MM or SP responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

When the results of each rank group are combined, 20% of the military member respondents report "yes" (I would extend), while 30% say "no." The remaining 50% indicate "maybe," but only for an incentive. The number of military members responding "yes" (I would extend) increases as rank increases. Conversely, more military members report "maybe" as rank decreases. Approximately an equal percentage of each rank group indicates that they would not extend their present tours even for an incentive. It is interesting to note that for each rank group wives indicate that they would be very willing to support or encourage the husbands' decision to extend the tour in USAREUR.

Several factors influencing extension decisions are also presented in Table 33. A significantly higher percentage of officer families report "family reasons" as being one thing that would stop them from extending their tours, while more enlisted and NCO families report "job reasons" as the critical factor.

Findings. About 20% of the military members respond "yes" (I would extend if given the chance), while 30% say "no" (I would not extend even for an incentive). The number saying "yes" increases with rank, while the number saying "no" is essentially equal across ranks. For each rank group, the wives indicate that they would be very willing to support the husband's decision to extend.

Officer families more often report "family reasons" as being one thing that would stop them from extending, while enlisted and NCO families more often cite "job reasons" as the critical factor.

Sponsor Support

Approximately 80% of all the married accompanied families surveyed were "command sponsored" and were thus eligible for housing support and other benefits in USAREUR. Table 34 shows, however, that only about one third of all those coming to USAREUR "command sponsored" actually had a sponsor assigned to them, or one who helped them during the PCS process.

Table 34

Command-Sponsored Families with a Sponsor Assigned by Rank

Command sponsored	
Enlisted	55% (110 people)
NCO	88% (522 people)
Officer	97% (147 people)
Percentage of command-sponsored families having a sponsor who was "assigned or helped"	
Enlisted	17% (19 people)
NCO	40% (211 people)
Officer	89% (131 people)

Military members were asked to indicate (yes/no) whether their sponsor took any of eight specific actions to support their family in the PCS move. Due to the small number of enlisted families who actually had a sponsor assigned (n = 19), response difference testing across all rank groups for the eight survey items was not carried out in Table 35. However, statistically significant differences were identified between the NCO and officer responses. Across seven of the eight types of support, significantly more officers than NCOs report that they had the help of a sponsor. The simple exception to the trend is that most soldiers in each rank group report that their sponsor sent information about the assignment in USAREUR.

Table 35

The Nature and Extent of Sponsor Support

Activities provided for the command-sponsored service members who reported having a sponsor who was "assigned or helped"

	Enlisted (19)	NCO (211)	Officer (131)
Sponsor wrote/called ahead of time	58%	63%"	85%"
Sponsor offered to help service member find quarters	37%	16%"	44%"
Sponsor sent information about assignment/USAREUR	79%	64%	75%
Sponsor met service member upon arrival	37%	43%"	76%"
Sponsor arranged for temporary quarters	16%	26%"	61%"
Sponsor showed service member around	37%	43%"	69%"
Sponsor gave helpful, practical information	37%	39%"	67%"
Sponsor helped in settling into quarters	26%	15%"	27%"

" = Significant difference of MM responses from only the rank group similarly designated by ".

The most commonly reported forms of support are "Sponsor wrote/called ahead of time," and "Sponsor sent information about the assignment to USAREUR," and were reported by more than half of the NCOs and officers. The two least frequently reported sponsorship activities are probably very important elements

of support: (1) sponsor offered to help find quarters, and (2) sponsor helped in settling into quarters.

Findings. While approximately 80% of the families in the sample are "command sponsored," only about one third of these report actually having had a sponsor assigned or one who helped.

Only 17% of the enlisted personnel who were command sponsored had a sponsor, while 40% of the NCOs and 89% of the officers had a sponsor assigned.

Significantly more officers report receiving support from their sponsor on almost all dimensions.

CONCLUSIONS

The above information on families has important implications for the Army. Its success in this area supports reenlistments and reinforces the value of the new initiative with respect to family support. In effect, and for whatever reason, families on balance seem to prosper in the Army. This may account for their high commitment to the Army and their feeling that an Army career can be good for the family, as well as their willingness to forbear the specific problems that are reported. Their reported commitment to the Army, however, may be a function of the degree to which the family unit is sustained. Hence, the Army supports its own best interests when it supports the Army family.

APPENDIX A

METHOD, SAMPLING PLAN, AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Method

The survey instrument was a collaborative effort between personnel from the University of Minnesota and the ARI USAREUR Field Unit. It contains specific scales prepared by the University of Minnesota, and questions added by Field Unit members. Approximately 400 questions were asked. In the compilation of data, the scale and the other categories of questions that were asked have been sorted into categories reflective of the White Paper and other USAREUR-specific issues.

The responses of the MM and SP are presented together where the same question was asked of each. However, only averages of each group are compared to one another. The responses of paired family members are not analyzed per se. In some cases questions were asked of only one or the other family member. The data are also organized relative to the enlisted, NCO, and officer groups. As can be seen by the following tables, the data are highlighted when significant response differences occur between the MMs of each rank group or the SPs of each rank group. The data are also highlighted when significant response differences occur between the MM and SP in the same rank group. Often the between-rank and family-member differences within each rank group are more meaningful than the absolute level of the responses themselves. The following interpretation of the data is based on both of these considerations. Only descriptive data in percentages are presented. Inferential analyses were not conducted on the data of different response categories.

Sampling Plan

The sampling plan was designed to meet the requirements for surveying 1,000 families in USAREUR within a 3-week period during the month of May 1983. The sampling approach was predicated on the premise that a representative slice of USAREUR families (e.g., rank, accompanied, and the number of dependents) would be related to the type of military unit assigned (i.e., combat arms, combat support, and combat service support), and that their experiences would be influenced by the type of military community in which they were located (small, medium, and large). The latter would also be influenced by whether they are in a relatively urban or rural German area.

Consequently, two related and overlapping layers of stratification were involved: type of unit and size of military community, recognizing that combat units would typically be found near smaller military communities as well as rural German areas. In addition, a proportional stratified sample was desired, where the ratio of combat unit types would be similar to their ratio in USAREUR and within the representative types of communities in which they would be located. Expert military judgment was used to select such units. The final unit/communities that were selected from those that were recommended was determined by the units stating that they would be available in the required timeframe (month of May 1983). These units and communities are described below.

Unit 1.	Combat arms	Community is small; surrounding German environment is rural
Unit 2.	Combat arms	Community is small; surrounding German environment is rural.
Unit 3.	Combat arms	Community is moderate in size; surrounding German environment is relatively urban and industrial.
Unit 4.	Combat support and Combat service support	American community is moderate in size; surrounding German environment is urban.
Unit 5.	Combat service support	American community is large; surrounding German environment is urban.
Unit 6.	Combat service support	American community is moderate in size; surrounding German environment is urban.
Unit 7.	Combat arms	American community is small to moderate in size; surrounding German environment is relatively rural.

As can be seen from the above information, four of the seven units were combat units located in small to moderate military communities and in rural or relatively rural German areas. The remaining three combat units were predominantly combat service support groups located in moderate or large military communities and in relatively urban German areas.

After the selection of the above units/communities, we departed from the usual stratified random sampling approach and elected to sample the entire population of married families in each of the units/communities selected (excluding those families with two married service members and single-parent families). This was easier and more practical and eliminated any sampling errors related to random sampling.

At each unit the service members were assembled at the same place and time and asked to take a survey set home, to fill out the survey independently from their spouses, and to return the completed surveys within 24 hours. The number of survey sets administered in each community, the number returned, and the number of usable survey sets are shown in Table 36. As can be seen in this table, a total of 1,227 sets of surveys was administered and 1,052 were returned; of these only 1,036 sets were in sufficiently completed form to serve as data for overall purposes of analysis. The number of usable survey sets, however, varied for specific groups of items. The above number of usable survey sets represented an 84.4% return rate.

Representativeness of Sample

Based on the SIDPERS data file in USAREUR, an analysis was conducted to determine the representativeness of the obtained sample relative to the total population of USAREUR married and accompanied families. The data are shown in Table 37. This table compares the number married in each rank category (E1-O6)

Table 36

The Number of Survey Sets Administered and Returned for Each Community

Community	Survey sets administered	Survey sets returned	Usable survey sets
Unit 1	189	143	143
Unit 2	260	223	223
Unit 3	160	134	129
Unit 4	181	180	169
Unit 5	138	113	113
Unit 6	132	118	118
Unit 7	167	141	141
Total	1,227	1,052	1,036

Each survey set contains one survey service number and one for the spouse.

85.7% surveys returned from those administered.
84.4% usable surveys from those administered.

Table 37

Comparison of the Percentage Married and Accompanied Relative to the Total Married in Each Rank Category Between the Sample and USAREUR Population

Rank	Total USAREUR married accompanied	Percentage of total USAREUR married accompanied	Percentage USAREUR married force	USAREUR sample married accompanied	Percentage of sample	Percentage of survey sample by rank
E1	86	0.1		1	0.1	
E2	212	0.3	19.88	3	0.3	20.7
E3	1,553	2.5		35	3.5	
E4	10,286	16.9		173	17.3	
E5	14,944	24.5		230	23.1	
E6	12,752	20.9		204	20.4	
E7	7,491	12.3	62.4	125	12.5	61.6
E8	2,336	3.8		44	4.4	
E9	574	0.9		12	1.2	
W1	329	0.5		3	0.3	
W2	1,140	1.9		9	0.9	
W3	762	1.2		5	0.5	
W4	228	0.4		0	--	
O1	333	0.5	17.1	5	0.5	17.7
O2	1,297	2.1		13	1.3	
O3	3,245	5.3		54	5.4	
O4	1,878	3.1		45	4.5	
O5	1,139	1.9		30	3.0	
O6	458	0.8		11	1.1	
	61,043*	100%	100%	1,002**	100%	100%

*6.3% of this figure are non-command sponsored.

**1,002 of the total 1,036 returned survey sets provided the rank information necessary for this analysis.

to the total number married of all ranks in terms of percentage for (a) our sample and (b) the USAREUR population. As can be seen from this data, our sample contains a roughly proportional percentage of married persons in each rank category relative to the percentage of the married USAREUR population in each rank category.

The USAREUR data shown in Table 37, however, must be qualified as follows:

1. USAREUR married and accompanied population data are not precisely known, due to a combination of several reasons such as normal delays in updating, the failure of service members to update their data, etc.

2. The reported USAREUR-wide data contain no information on single-parent families or families with two military members, which were also excluded intentionally from our sample.

3. USAREUR-wide data on accompanied families may include some cases where the service member is accompanied by a child, but not a spouse.

4. Data on accompanied, non-command sponsored families may be underreported in the USAREUR data, due to lack of incentive on the part of service members to do so. The available data indicate that 6.3% of the 61,043 married and accompanied USAREUR families were nor command sponsored. In our sample this percentage was 16.6%.

The number of married and accompanied service members in USAREUR is compared to the total number of service members in USAREUR in Table 38. This table shows the percentage of each rank category in USAREUR that are married and accompanied, relative to the total number of SMs in that rank category. Overall, married and accompanied service members represent 27.7% of the service members in USAREUR.[1] Data were not available on how many service members in Europe are married and unaccompanied. The data available to us indicate, however, that at least 50% of the total Army population is married.[2]

---

[1]This number may be underestimated. The USAREUR Personnel Opinion Survey (UPOS) conducted in December 1983 with 6,600 respondents obtained a figure of 43%.

[2]Raw data from Manpower Data Center (DOD), Arlington, VA, December 1980, as compiled by Family Resources Center, March 1982.

Table 38

Percentage of Each Rank Category in USAREUR in Comparison to the Percentage of the Married and Accompanied in That Rank Category

Rank	Total USAREUR service members	Percentage of total in each rank category	Total USAREUR married and accompanied	Percentage of married within each rank category
E1	5,716		86	
E2	8,979	51.75	212	10.68
E3	34,570		1,553	
E4	64,346		10,286	
E5	42,843		14,944	
E6	24,712		12,752	
E7	13,016	38.83	7,491	44.70
E8	3,944		2,336	
E9	722		574	
W1	697		329	
W2	1,742		1,140	
W3	1,076		762	
W4	324		228	
O1	1,904	9.42	333	52.26
O2	3,835		1,297	
O3	6,251		3,245	
O4	2,754		1,878	
O5	1,541		1,139	
O6	560		458	
	219,532	100%	61,043*	

*27.8% of total USAREUR service members.

APPENDIX B

REFERENCES

McCubbin, H. I., and Patterson, J. M. One thousand Army families: Strengths, coping and supports. University of Minnesota, 1983.

Ozkaptan, H., Sanders, W. R., and Holz, R. F. Receptiveness of Army families in USAREUR to incentives for extension. ARI Research Report 1376, August 1984.

White Paper, 1983--The Army Family. Chief of Staff, U.S. Army.

Army Family Action Plan. Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, 1984.